THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

Public Library

VOL. XL, No. 3 JULY, 1933

What the New Church Is
HENRI G. DE GEYMULLER 129

Doctrine: Its Origin and Its Relation to Human Reason
PAUL HARTLEY 147

Swedenborg's Use of Scripture for Doctrine (II)
WILLIAM FREDERICK WUNSCH 167

Investments for the Future of the Church
CAROLYN ALLISON BLACKMER 177

The Last Temptation
OTHMAR TOBISCH 186

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. H. Clinton Hay in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON.

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 8 Cents, and to Europe 16 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE NEW JERUSALEM.—

President, Rev. Fred Sidney Mayer, 3812 Barrington Road, Baltimore, Md.; *Vice-President*, Mr. Ezra Hyde Alden, 1419 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.; *Secretary*, Mr. B. A. Whittemore, 134 Bowdoin Street, Boston 9, Mass.; *Treasurer*, Mr. Albert P. Carter, 511 Barristers Hall, Boston, Mass.

THE
NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XL] JULY, 1933 [No. 3

WHAT THE NEW CHURCH IS

BY HENRI G. DE GEYMULLER

IN our issue of last January* we published, under the title "What the New Church Is," some remarks translated from the English which had previously appeared in the *New-Church Herald* of October 1, 1932. This article suggested to one of our correspondents the following reflections. We publish them all the more willingly as we are persuaded that the author of the article in the *New-Church Herald* did not mean to treat the problem of the Church in a complete way, but to emphasize rather one of its aspects (that which Mr. H. G. de Geymuller in his reply calls the *subjective* Church) in order to accentuate its importance. In fact, what end would be served by the notion of a revealed religion (the objective Church), if this truth were not in the end to contribute to the building of the Church (subjective) in the heart of man? The extract reprinted from the *New-Church Herald* will at least have had the effect of provoking the interesting contribution of Mr. H. G. de Geymuller, with which we agree in principle, and which, we hope, will interest our readers.

*The present paper appeared in *Le Messager de la Nouvelle Eglise* of March, 1933. We are indebted to Mr. Hugh M. Hite for this translation.—*Editors.*

To the Editor of the *Messenger:*

The tenor of some passages published in the *Messenger* of January, 1933, under the title "What the Church Is" seems to me to call for some important qualifications, which I shall be obliged to you if you will bring to the attention of your readers. Let me say that in the article in question we are presented with a personal opinion,— a wide-spread opinion, it is true, but nevertheless a mere opinion,— and not, properly speaking, a doctrine of the Church. A publication which styles itself *The Messenger of the New Church* proclaims by its very name that there actually exists a New Church, and that this Church has its reason for being in the message which it carries to the world. This message would not be a real "message," if the New Church were only an *interior* state, only a *subjective* reality. In fact, to speak in the name of the New Church is not to speak primarily in the name of an individual experience, but in the name of a reality vastly greater, infinitely wider, than the range of the individual; a reality in which men may participate by the consent of their understanding, by the disposition of their will, and by the conduct of their life, but which they could not by any right constitute, nor for a much stronger reason beget in one way or another.

The Church is a complex reality. That is to say, it embraces multiple and complementary aspects. All are necessary for the constitution and consequently for the definition of the whole. It is therefore perfectly puerile to wish to single out one particular aspect of reality in order to oppose it arbitrarily to some other. What "truly" constitutes the Church differs necessarily according to the particular point of view where one is placed, according to the purpose in mind. Between these points of view, these different meanings, there is no incompatibility, no antinomy. The fact that the "Church" at different times is presented in a new light, under a new form, consequently that it constitutes an essentially variable notion (and this by definition), should move us to be cautious, and prevent us from making affirmations

of too general a character, which in any state of the case can apply properly only to one aspect of the reality.

One of the worst bad habits of the mind is that of establishing definitions based upon improper generalizations, which amount to unifying arbitrarily a complex reality by identifying without qualification the different elements of which it is composed. Quite to the contrary, it is necessary to think of what is distinct as distinct. For once our mind has committed the initial blunder of neglecting necessary distinctions, our thought becomes lost in the worst of confusion. To find a way out, it then proceeds to imaginary oppositions and illegitimate exclusions. In fact, having chosen one or another particular characteristic in order to make it the essential quality of the whole, we shall be quite naturally inclined to deny to this whole thus diminished all the qualities appropriate to its other constituent elements. To proceed in such a manner is evidently a grievous error; but however much to be regretted, we have unhappily made ourselves guilty of this error as regards the Church. The time seems to me to have arrived for us to take account of this frankly, and to act with courage accordingly. Alas! minds too much given to simplifying are legion in the world here below. It is so tempting to set up a summary formula, which gives the illusion of a prime and universal truth, easy to grasp and easy of application,— all the more easy because it sanctions an existing state of things and consequently necessitates no precise effort and no concerted action. The same thing can be said of formulas that are too general as of the cylinders of drums or of tom-toms. The louder they are, the more empty are they and more apt to strike the ears of the public. Well do all the demagogues and mystagogues know this.

But we are not here to promote religious demagogy, the worst of all! No more are we here to repeat fine empty phrases (in spite of their false show of superior wisdom). We are here above all to see things as they are, to learn to know reality under all its aspects, and to compel respect for

the rights of truth which at one and the same time is one and multiple.

Note that the most tenacious prejudices are always those which arise from a view of things too much simplified, too summary. Those who know the complexity of special problems know that the truth does not present itself at the first stroke to the first comer who seeks it; and that truth is often very different from what it appears to be at the first approach. Only disinterested and indefatigable seekers after truth have the mind really open and free from prejudices. It is always dangerous to think with the aid of ready-made phrases and stereotyped formulas, for these have the tendency to close the mind to all evidence furnished by the facts.

I charge the article of the *Herald* (which, I am convinced, the *Messenger* reproduced with the best intentions) with containing only half-truths on the subject of the Church; that is to say, affirmations which are true only from a certain point of view, only to the degree that they characterize one single aspect which the Church presents, namely, the subjective aspect. These half-truths are immediately and quite naturally transformed into counter truths, when the author of the article in question makes use of them to characterize the whole of the reality designated by the term "Church," and all the more so, when he uses them to exclude from the "true Church" all the attributes which legitimately characterize the other aspect (the objective aspect) of the Church. This fashion of juggling away one of the most important sides of the question can in no wise be justified; and it requires to be brought in question, if we wish to avoid a reign of obscurantism, and to assure our Church the possibility of normal development.

When we speak of the "real Church," of the "true Church," we imply that there is a "non-real Church," a "false Church." Now, as we have been seriously admonished that the "true Church" can only be an interior reality, it follows that all which is not this interior reality is not the "real Church"; in other words, it is not really the Church.

Expressed in this more brutal fashion (for unless he wished to speak with the intention of saying nothing, such is properly the meaning of the aphorisms formulated by the author in his article), this doctrine will have more chance of striking our minds by its speciousness. In fact, the thesis of the *Herald* amounts to saying that since the subjective Church (a purely "spiritual" reality) is the real Church, the objective Church can be neither "real" nor "spiritual."

The word "real" has, after all, meaning only in opposition to the word "false" or "apparent." One should then make use of it only to distinguish the true from the false, the essential from the incidental, and here in a domain where such a distinction has a meaning and a reason for being, that is to say, in a domain where the application of identifying criteria is indispensable. The word "real" loses every sort of significance as a qualifying adjective when it is a question of distinguishing between two orders of different realities. The fact of being "real" is a consequence, a quality which is common to these different orders of reality. Now, it is not by features which are common to them that things are distinguished one from another. If we choose reality as the distinctive character, as the criterion, for opposing two different domains each to the other, we are necessarily forced to deny this reality to one or the other of these domains; and that is absurd.

For the subjective Church to be real, it must be and remain truly subjective; for the objective Church to be real, it must be and remain truly objective. It is, then, not the subjectivity or objectivity that enables us to distinguish between the Church which is real and the Church which is not. The Church is rightfully the Church both in its objective and in its subjective form. To say that the Church is truly the Church only in one of these forms (to the exclusion of the other) is to assert a contra-truth; it is to declare a *non vera,* neither more nor less.

I know well the argument of the defenders of the purely subjective Church. They take their stand upon the fact that

Swedenborg said somewhere: "Where the truth is known, there it is possible to have the Church; but the Church is really only there where the truth is practiced." From this phrase there have been drawn the most unexpected and the most astonishing inferences. I am convinced that if Swedenborg had foreseen them, he would have expressed himself in a more precise way. He had, however, a right to expect a minimum of common sense on the part of his reader. He took it for granted that his thought was so clear that the reader endowed with average intelligence would have no difficulty in comprehending it. Doubtless he did not have in view the theological warfare with texts as weapons, nor the summoning of these latter by the defenders of an ideology on the watch for everything which could be interpreted as a confirmation of the same. However that may be, it must be obvious to everyone that, in the passage in question, Swedenborg could have had in mind only the Church interior, subjective, and individual, and that in stating the conditions for the existence of this (conditions which transform a virtuality, a potentiality, into an actuality), he by no means meant to bring in question the existence of the exterior Church, whose conditions of actuality are absolutely different. Wherever the Truth is known, preached, and taught, there by definition is the Church, a *teaching Church;* and wherever there is the teaching Church, there can be the Church (interior) among the members of the Church which is taught; but the Church will be really among them only if they put into practice the truths which constitute the very being of the objective Church. The being of the teaching or objective Church is the universal truth revealed by the Lord Himself; while the being of the interior Church is the subjective and individual good in the hearts of the faithful. It would be absurd to consider the objective Church as non-real, because its members do not all practice a saintly and virtuous life. The teaching Church can do no more than proclaim the truth. It is the truth that leads men to good; and if they do not wish to make use of it to regulate their

conduct, the Church is not responsible for that neglect, and it exists no less rightfully because of it, no more than the objective truth ceases to exist because of the fact that there are men who do not apply it to their lives. I would even say that the less virtuous men are, the more necessary is the external Church; for it is the champion of all good, because it is the guardian of the truth. Men left to themselves end by giving up all interest in the truth, when they do not practice it. Now it is essential that the truth be continually defended and taught. Only the objective Church, independent in itself of the state of individual regeneration of the faithful, can defend the Divine Truth with effectiveness. Let us also note that even if the objective Church is impotent to implant good in the hearts of the faithful,— individual regeneration being in the domain of conscience,— it can nevertheless enforce a collective morality, and establish a state of things implying virtue and proclaiming the necessity of it.

Moreover, Swedenborg has himself spoken of truth while speaking of the Church in the passage with which we are now dealing. In fact he has said in many places that there is no faith without charity, no truth apart from good. This should evidently be understood in the *subjective* sense; for no one, I suppose, would pretend to assert that the truth, which has its quality from God, ceases to be truth because it is known by a certain number of persons who are not concerned about practicing it. The truth is true because it is the truth. Its immutable and eternal essence could not be affected even if all men did not obey it and did not know it. It is just for that reason that it is said to be *objective;* otherwise it would be only a subjective reality, and perpetually changing. The faith of the Church, as opposed to the faith of the faithful, is an invariable datum, fixed once for all by revelation. One can at any moment find it in the doctrines and writings of the Church, whatever may be the spiritual state of the members of the Church. The faith of the Church is one thing; the faith of man is another. The first is objective because it is solidly based on revealed truth; the

second is subjective because it is proportional to the good of love which the individual cherishes in his heart. To judge of their genuineness, therefore, we must not apply to them the same criteria.

It is the same with what concerns the external and the internal Church. The same measure is not applicable to both. The actuality of the one does not imply the actuality of the other. The actuality of the teaching Church does, however, imply the potentiality of the internal Church, which to become actual needs the intervention of psychological factors, purely subjective. It is in this sense that it is proper to interpret the statement of Swedenborg: Where the truth is known (that is to say, where the external or teaching Church exists), there it is possible to have the Church (internal, in man); but this exists (in actuality) only if man practices the good. This is the one and only way to interpret this text without doing violence to the whole of Swedenborg's doctrine of the Church. In fact, there are very many passages in the Writings where it is specifically stated that doctrine constitutes the Church; that the Church is such as is the doctrine. Moreover, the decisive proof that the word "Church" is properly applied to a reality other than a purely subjective and individual reality is furnished us by this simple fact, to which I have already alluded, namely, that Swedenborg speaks constantly of the truths *of* the New Church, the doctrines *of* the Church, the truth *of* the Church, etc.

Let us observe also that Swedenborg adopts the term "Church militant," and this less to characterize the Church in its struggles against the errors of the other Christian Churches, than to characterize the effort of the teaching Church to implant good in its worshippers. It is the ceaseless combat of truth against the false and the evil. The Church militant, then, is an external reality which seeks to engender an internal reality. In the measure that man realizes by regeneration this internal reality, he participates in the Church triumphant and in the communion of saints.

But we must not deny the genuineness of the Church militant under the pretext that it is only a means towards attaining the Church triumphant, that is to say, the regeneration of the individual and heaven. The Church militant and teaching is of Divine right, for it is consubstantial with revealed truth. The Lord was able to institute it immediately, because the truth exists in itself, and its actuality does not depend in any way upon the approbation or the obedience of men. In instituting the Church militant actually, the Lord virtually created the Church triumphant, for He established by this fact the conditions which render the latter possible. In fact, the Church militant teaches the truth; and the truth in the understanding is the permanent possibility of good in the heart.

When we speak of the "New Church," and especially when we seek to extend and strengthen it, we necessarily have in view a reality superior to men, a reality whose being is not constituted by men. The number and the quality of the individual members do not enter into its definition. The only thing which counts is *its teaching,* the teaching which the Writings call the "doctrine of the New Church." This "New Church" is for us *the Church,* our spiritual mother, which the Decalogue commands us to honor. Now, it is not by denying the genuineness of its visible presence among us that we honor it. It is not by refusing to recognize its Divine Right; it is not by reducing it to a mere human association! Nevertheless, it is just that which we have done in practice.

I am deeply convinced that the excessively slow progress of the New Church is above all attributable to the fact that the majority of us have not yet sufficiently realized the objective character of the Church, the character which results from the objectivity of the New Revelation. It is this that has rooted in us the idea that there is a sort of antinomy or incompatibility between the real Church and the visible Church. We have sinned by omission in refusing to recognize the autonomy and the independence of the moral per-

sonality of the Church, a personality essentially distinct from that of its members. We have been wrong in not considering the Church as a Divine institution, but as an essentially human organization, convenient and useful, as a purely practical necessity, born from the contingencies of social life.

When one has adopted the idea that the Church as an institution, as a visible organism, could never be the "real Church," it is evident that one could never feel for it a very ardent love. It is no less evident that one would never feel bound by any special rule, by any particular principle, when it comes to establishing the bases of an ecclesiastical organism which one considers beforehand as being unable by its very nature to have anything in common with the "real Church." This result follows: that all forms, all systems, are admitted in advance as equally defensible, and on a par with each other, at least as regards right. As to establishing a choice among them, that is simply a matter of expediency. One is thus placed at a point of view exclusively utilitarian and pragmatic, which is perfectly logical if the contingent aspect which one has given the problem that one seeks to solve is granted. It would be quite another thing if one took into account that the whole of the problem of the organization of the Church is dominated by the question of its Divine right.

Does this Divine right exist, or is it only a fiction? If it does exist, is it not our first duty to recognize that fact, and to be very careful that the constitution of the external Church be such that it shall constantly preserve both an *expression* and a *safeguard* of this Divine right? That can be done; and it should be done. Alas, it has not yet been done!

As a matter of fact I do not know whether the constitution of any organization of our Church had been proclaimed for the purpose of giving concrete expression to the Divine right of the Church. If there exist any document maintaining such a claim, I should be happy to know of it;

but in such a case I should experience the same astonishment as I should in ascertaining that a country had given itself a republican constitution with the intention of proclaiming the legitimacy of the rights of a monarchy.

In any event I take the liberty of asserting that there still prevails (although certain signs seem to indicate a slow development towards the truth) a regrettable misunderstanding on the subject of the real nature of the objective Church. The current ideas on this point are the product of protestant subjectivism. They do not constitute even approximations to revealed truth, but real perversions of the teachings, both implicit and explicit, of the Writings of Swedenborg. He never ceased to be an objectivist, whether as scientist, as philosopher, as theologian, or as seer. Good and truth exist *outside* of the individual before existing *in* him; and even when *in* him they do not belong to him, but continue to belong to the Lord and to the Church.

The qualities which constitute the Church *in* man are not random qualities; they are the very ones which constitute the Church *outside* of man, and which he has assimilated. If it were otherwise, think you that Swedenborg would have used the word "Church" to characterize the interior state of the regenerated man? The simple fact that the Writings of the New Church use the word "Church" in this figurative sense proves that we are confronted with a *derived* reality, — a subjective reality derived from the objective reality designated by the term "Church" in its proper meaning.

The simple fact that it is right and proper to speak of a teaching *of* the New Church shows that this is quite another thing than a simple interior state. In fact, when the New Church speaks, it is not the men who compose it (from the quantitative point of view) who speak. The truths of the Church are not the ideas of its members. Its doctrines are not those which its faithful adherents decree. When Swedenborg speaks of the New Church, of its doctrines, of its faith, of its principles, of its mission, of its future, of its eternal duration, etc., he by no means intends to speak of

the men who will compose it, for these are but the recipients. Now, a recipient cannot confer being to the reality which he receives; he can only assure it an exterior existence. Therefore, no man has the right to say, "Here is *my* truth, for the real church is in me"; but the objective Church has not only the right but still more the duty to say, "Here is *my* truth, for I am the New Church founded by the Lord Himself; and the truths of the New Revelation constitute my very essence."

Man can never be anything but the Church in its *least* form. All the more reason for not losing sight of the Church in its *largest* form! The trees must not prevent us from seeing the forest. The Church is analogous to heaven. The angel is heaven in its least form; but that fact does not at all prevent heaven in its greatest form from existing prior to and outside of him. It is the macro-cosm which permits the micro-cosm to exist and subsist, and not *vice versa;* for, as Swedenborg says, it is not the angels who constitute heaven, but it is the Divine of the Lord. The angel is only an angel to the degree in which he embodies the principles and qualities which constitute the proper character of heaven. It is in this sense that the kingdom of heaven is *within* us. The fact of our not embodying in ourselves the qualities of heaven and the principles of the Church does not prevent either heaven or the Church from existing outside of us; but it does prevent *us* from really being an integral part of it.

Swedenborg wrote that the Church (note well: *the Church)* is the neighbor in preference to fatherland, to society, to family, or to any individual; for it is the neighbor "in the plural." Now, by "plural" Swedenborg does not merely intend to oppose number to unity (which would be absurd, granted that number is composed of unities), but, above all, to distinguish between the general quality and the individual quantity. That is so true that he has hastened to add that the "neighbor" *par excellence* is the good and the true (that is to say, the universal itself), and that it is that

which we should love, even in individuals taken separately. Now, the objective Church is based not on the number of its adherents, but on universal truth, objectively revealed by the Lord. To love the Church as one's neighbor, is to love saving Truth,— a condition of salvation for each and for all. To see the Church only in one's self, to strive only for one's own personal salvation, is to deny that we are saved by a common truth, that is to say, a truth outside and above ourselves. To believe that one might build an external and objective Church on a base purely individualistic, is to indulge in false reasoning even as concerns individual salvation. In fact, man will really forget himself, will find his redemption, his true life, only in the measure in which he gives himself entirely to a work which surpasses him, only in the measure in which he communicates with the universal in returning to it what he has received. All organic life is based on this principle. The different organs of the body live only by what they receive from the whole and by that which they return to it in one form or another. Such is the law that rules the co-existence and the co-operation of the one and of the multiple, of the universal and of the particular. May this law be for us the supreme law; *suprema lex.*

Swedenborg often employs certain words in a figurative sense. Thus he sometimes characterizes the part by the whole, and *vice versa;* for the part reproduces the dominant characteristic of the whole, which in its turn feels the particular qualities of its individual elements. That is all perfectly legitimate. But what is not legitimate is, *not to think clearly concerning distinguishing characteristics;* it is to proceed to exclusions, to arbitrary oppositions, which take their point of departure from assimilations inadmissible because too absolute.

It is almost always by identifications pushed to the point of effacing all distinctive characteristics that one empties words of their proper meaning. From that time all accurate thinking becomes impossible; just as every commercial transaction becomes illusory, if the negotiations are not

based on the same monetary standard. Confusion reigns in the mind. Intellectual probity disappears. The simplest, most elementary truths take on the aspect of insoluble problems, and become the occasion for interminable academic discussions. Byzantinism runs riot. Each person maintains his own point of view, for each is right and the whole world is wrong. Meanwhile, the ship of the Church lists badly and risks capsizing.

Let us then strive to give words their precise and proper meanings. Let us beware of emptying the word "Church" of its real content, its first meaning, under the pretext that this word possesses several derived meanings. Let us not do violence to language in our intention to formulate deep and hidden truths; and if, in order to express a thought particularly original, we find ourselves obliged to have recourse to an unexpected identification by using the copula "is," let us not forget that the identity of traits common to two orders of reality by no means implies the identity of the characteristics which distinguish these two orders in other respects. The copula "is" can always be transformed to "is not," and when that is done difficulties and misunderstandings usually begin; for a proposition can be true in a certain way in its affirmative form, and cease to be true when one reverses it and gives it a negative turn of phrase.

To define the Church in general by negations risks provoking the rejection of what really constitutes its being and existence in some particular manner. That, however, is what has taken place with us. Because of this fact, our thought has taken a certain tendency against which we are having much difficulty to re-act. But we *must* re-act, if we do not wish to sacrifice the Church on the altar of a false mysticism.

Let us then be done with saying, "The Church is not an institution"; but let us correct this negation (wholly illegitimate in this form) by saying, "The Church is not a *human institution.*" As a matter of fact, it is a *Divine* institution. Let us have done with saying, "The real Church has

no relation with the form of its exterior organization"; but rather let us say, "The organization of the visible Church ought worthily to represent the Divine institution, of which it should be the symbol; it ought to make it concrete by giving it actuality in the sense-world and making it accessible." Let us not forget that all power resides in ultimates, *in ultimis,* and that truth needs instruments in order to manifest itself and to act.

Let us, then, adopt an affirmative attitude towards the Church; and let us no longer be paralyzed by fruitness negations. Only so can we be creators and builders of events.

I recommend to all our friends the reading of numbers 52-55 of Swedenborg's own outline of the "Coronis, or Appendix to the True Christian Religion." He there treats summarily of the New Church in the following words (the comments in brackets are mine):

52. *This New Church, truly Christian, which is being established today by the Lord* [which proves that it is indeed a Divine institution] *will endure forever* [because it is infinitely more than a purely individual reality, bound up with the ephemeral existence of men], *confirmed by the Word of both Testaments. It was foreseen from the creation of the world. It will be the crown of the four preceding churches, because it will have in it true faith and true charity.* [We read in no. 53 of the 'Invitation to the New Church': 'As we have now *in* the church one God who is God-Man and Man-God, *this* church is called the crown of the churches.' Here it is a statement of an objective fact; as one can see, it suffices to constitute and characterize the New Church.]

53. *In* this New Church there will be spiritual peace, which is glory, and which is internal blessedness of life,—also confirmed by the word of both Testaments. [As is the church, so are its faithful.]

54. These things will be *in* this New Church [note the word "in"], because of the conjunction with the Lord, and through Him with God the Father. [Swedenborg says here that certain subjective states—such as spiritual peace and internal blessedness of life—will be *in* the church because 'we now have *in* the church one God, who is God-Man and Man-God.' Thus it is the certitude of this objective fact, *proper to the collective church,* which permits Swedenborg to affirm the existence of certain subjective states *in*

the members of this church; and this in spite of the fact that Swedenborg could not have known in advance the interior and individual state of any one of them. But Swedenborg was able to predict the effect from the cause, which proves that what characterizes the church *as a church* are its intrinsic attributes, its qualifying characteristics, and not its members. However, it is quite legitimate to formulate in principle the adage, *'As is the church, so are its faithful.*]

55. An invitation to the entire Christian world to this church, and an exhortation to receive worthily the Lord, who foretold that He would come into the world for the sake of this church and to this church.

The following is another passage which seems to me significant. I abridge it in order to bring out more clearly its teaching.

It is known in the church that the church is the body of Christ. . . . In this body the Lord is the soul or the life. . . . The church on earth is . . . the external man [or the body]. . . . [The Lord, by the church, is thus present in the world] as is the soul by its body. (Invitation to the New Church, n. 28.)

Likewise in the preamble to "The Invitation to the New Church" we read the following:

This [New] Church has been *founded* and *established* not by miracles, but by the revelation of the spiritual sense, and by the introduction of my spirit and at the same time of my [spiritual] body into the spiritual world, so that I might know what heaven is and what hell is, and so that from the light proceeding from the Lord I might immediately derive *the truths of faith* by which man is led to life eternal.

Note that "the Church has been founded and established" *by objective facts, absolutely independent of the will of men, and to which facts men have in no way contributed;* that is, by purely providential acts which constitute a direct intervention by the Lord in the development of His Church on earth. These acts are: (1) the revelation of the spiritual sense; (2) the introduction of Swedenborg's spirit into the spiritual world; and (3) the revelation of the truths of faith "derived immediately from the light proceeding from the Lord." It results indubitably from these undeniable facts

that the founding and the establishment of the New Church constitute *an objective and positive fact, an historical reality.*

At the very end of the "Invitation" there is a small summary (doubtless the summary of a chapter which Swedenborg meant to write) which contains the following words: "Re-establishment and New Church; what it will be." I take the liberty of pointing out to your readers the word "re-establishment," which seems to me significant in that it indicates that the New Church constitutes a *re-establishment* of the Christian Church, or rather the re-establishment of the real Church in the Christian world, and not the *abolition* of the Church as a divine institution and its *replacement* by some sort of purely interior and spiritual reality. Let us be on our guard lest we be iconoclasts and abolitionists. Let us attack degenerate forms of the Church, but while so doing let us not do injury to the proper idea and the very principle of the Church. Let us leave to the incoherence of Protestant dogma the sad privilege of opposing unduly the *spiritual* and the *visible*. The spirituality of an institution resides in the quality of its essence; and if the Church is really the body of Christ, which the Lord uses to become more particularly present in the world (as the soul becomes present by its body), then it is not only *spiritual* but *Divine* by its internal essence. The external is *spiritualized* by the internal, because the former is qualified by the latter; and "it is for this reason that by the correspondences [between spiritual and natural things] the sacraments have been instituted, in which, as a consequence, there exists Divine power" (Invitation, at end). This phrase is doubtless the last which Swedenborg as a revelator wrote; for if the sacraments are of Divine institution, the Church, which alone has the right to administer them in the name of the Lord, is equally of Divine institution.

Let us then either make the Church or else resign ourselves to seeing groups, circles, and coteries swarm about, living on its death,— living on its death because their very existence presupposes the absence of the Church, or rather

the very negation of the Church. In fact the multiplicity of religious groups and independent ecclesiastical organizations is incompatible with the universality and unity of the doctrine; it can only justify itself by invoking factors absolutely foreign to the very essence of the Church.

Now, as long as one bases the *existence* of the Church on anything else than on the very qualities of its *being,* the Church will not properly exist as a Divine institution; but we shall have, in the language of the author of the *Herald's* article, only "associations of men, temporary, always imperfect, always changing, then dying and taking on new forms." Now, the Church should be *immortal.* That which "changes perpetually and ends by dying" cannot under a "new form" end in anything but a cadaverous state. A body which changes perpetually in form has no soul to maintain its being; and the changes which are seen in it are those of decomposition and death. In fact, "the form of the body is the soul in its ultimates."

The Church, then, is infinitely more than a simple association of men. How much longer will it take for this truth to be finally understood by everybody? When at last it is understood, the greatest, brightest hopes will be permitted. That is why I feel it my duty to imitate the ancient Cato, and end this long letter by repeating *"ceterum censeo ecclesiam esse ædificandam."*

H. G. DE GEYMULLER.

DOCTRINE: ITS ORIGIN AND ITS RELATION TO HUMAN REASON

By Paul Hartley.

WE are to consider the status of doctrine according to the exposition of the internal sense of Genesis XX in Swedenborg's "Arcana Cœlestia." Unless otherwise noted, the numbers in parentheses throughout this paper refer to the sections of that work.

The Celestial Origin of Doctrine.—The Doctrine of charity and faith in respect to its celestial origin is especially treated of in Genesis XX, the literal sense of which tells of Abraham's visit to Gerar. The burden of the internal sense of this chapter is this: that as the Lord was instructed in doctrinal matters of charity and faith, He at first thought that the rational faculty should be consulted, but that He came to see the celestial origin and spiritual character of the Doctrine, and that all things rational, as well as all knowledges, are serviceable in the Divine interests of Doctrine, like a covering or garment. (2496-7.)

The Lord's Perceptive Finding in Regard to the Origin of Doctrine.—(Gen. XX 3: "Behold, thou, Abimelech, wilt die because of the woman, for she is married to a husband.") In regard to subject matter, the Doctrine of faith appears as if it possessed a considerable amount of rational and even of natural contents. This appearance is actually presented in the Word in its literal or external sense. This, however, is explained by the consideration that the Word is for man, and has been in this manner accommodated to him, so that the question as to the real source or authorship of Doctrine still remains open. If the human rational is examined in this connection, it soon becomes evident that it is confined to *appearances* of what is good and true, which appearances are not necessarily genuine. Moreover, the mind is beset by

fallacies which arise through external sense experience and are confirmed by knowledge stored in the memory, which induce obscurity in these appearances of truth; for instance, the fallacy that the exigencies of practical affairs are more urgent, and therefore more important, than considerations of doctrinal principles. As all rational thought terminates in external experience, it is easy to see that the Doctrine of faith soon becomes null and void in the minds of those who consult the rational as the final arbiter and authority in doctrinal matters.

All this shows that nothing doctrinal of faith can begin from the human rational, still less be constructed from it. To the question as to the origin and authorship of Doctrine, there is then only one possible answer remaining: Doctrine is intrinsically spiritual in character, and of Divine origin. It must be from the Lord's Divine Itself and the Divine Human, indeed so entirely that *the Lord is Doctrine Itself.**

Moreover, the contents of Doctrine, being of so exalted origin, involve spiritual truth, which is so conjoined with the spirit of love and charity, as to form a heavenly marriage of good and truth, reflecting the Divine union of Divine Good and Divine Truth.

This then is the perceptive finding as regards Doctrine, which the Lord Himself arrived at in His state of adjustment to the status of mankind. (2516-7†.)

Adaptation of Doctrine to Human Reason.—(Gen. XX 4-6: Abimelech is guiltless and justified by what he has been told, and God agrees, but tells him also of the necessity of restraining him from sin.) Since, then, the Doctrine of faith is of Divine origin, thus from a source infinitely above the human rational faculty, the latter is not consulted in

---

**Ut Dominus sit ipsa Doctrina, quare etiam in Verbo nominatur Verbum, Veritas, Lux, Via, Janua.*

†How the Lord, Who is here identified with Doctrine, arrived at this perceptive finding regarding the Divine origin of Doctrine, could be shown in a separate treatise on the Lord's Life, also according to this chapter in the "Arcana."

the original formulation of the Doctrine. The specific reason for not consulting the human rational is that the Doctrine in its integrity would be violated and become null and void if subjected to review by a limited and inferior authority which is sure to judge from appearances and fallacies. Yet because it is the human rational which receives the Doctrine and its burden of good and truth for man's spiritual life, it appears at first as if the rational ought to be present at the formulation of Doctrine, so that from the limited human point of view the question, whether the rational should be consulted, seems at least debatable. From this point of view the thought of consulting the rational seems to suggest itself without any implication of wrong, because the truths present in the rational, although acquired by the external way of sense perception, at least appear as truths, and through influx of Divine Love become forms of good and of charity, the good being modified in these truths according to the quality of the latter.

Since, then, it is the Divine which is prior to the human rational that flows into the latter, and not vice-versa, it follows that the Doctrine, in order to be brought into some working relation to man's rational faculty, is somehow to be adjusted to man. Adaptation of the Doctrine to man's status and consequent appeal to human reason is a necessary condition of man's reception. If truth from a Divine origin were set forth naked, it would never be received, but would completely transcend man's comprehension and therefore his belief, especially in the case of those whose religion is in the main external. It is for this reason that the Word—especially the Old Testament—is in its literal sense accommodated to the apprehension and genius of the people to whom it was originally addressed, and that so little is said concerning such important subjects as the other life, salvation, and man's internal. It is for the same reason that the Lord spoke in parables (cf. Mt. XIII 13; John XII 40.)

A better understanding of this may be had in the light of a closer study of the Doctrine of faith. Being spiritual

from Divine origin, the Doctrine is Divine Truth from Divine Love, and therefore altogether Divine. This Divine Doctrine, which in itself is incomprehensible because above all human comprehension and understanding, can nevertheless flow in through the Lord's Divine Human into man's rational, where it is received "according to the truths which are therein; thus variously, and not with one as with another."

In so far, therefore, as the truths with a man are more genuine, so far the Divine which flows in is received more perfectly, and so far the man's understanding is enlightened.

In the Lord's Word are truths themselves; but in its literal sense are truths which are accommodated to the apprehension of those who are in external worship; whereas in its internal sense are truths accommodated to those who are internal men; that is, to those who are angelic as to doctrine and at the same time as to life. Their rational is enlightened therefrom to such a degree that their enlightenment is compared to the brightness of the stars and of the sun (Dan. XII 3; Mt. XIII 43). Hence it is plain how important it is that interior truth be known and received. These truths may indeed be known, but by no means received, except by those who have love to the Lord, or faith in Him; for as the Lord is the Divine Good, so He is the Divine Truth; consequently He is doctrine itself, since whatever is in the doctrine of true faith looks to the Lord, and looks also to the heavenly kingdom and the church. (2518-2531.)

(Gen. XX 7: Abimelech is to restore Sarah to her husband, who is to intercede; refusal to restore her has deadly consequences.) It then follows that the spiritual truth of Doctrine is to be produced* without taint from the rational. In fact, the presentation of Doctrine is from a higher authority; indeed, the Doctrine as we have it is an adjustment, from higher levels of comprehension, to the human understanding in a rational manner. Doctrine is dictated in the Word according to man's rational comprehension.†

In its international sense, however, the Word is elevated to the

*_Quod spirituale verum doctrinæ immune redderet a rationali._

†The case herein is the same as it is with a parent who is teaching his little boys and girls. When he is teaching, he sets forth everything in accordance with their genius, although he himself thinks from what is more interior or higher; otherwise it would be teach-

angelic understanding; and yet that sense, in its highest elevation in which it is perceived by the angels, is infinitely below the Divine. . . . [It may be said, therefore, that] as the Lord is the Word, He is also Doctrine; for there is no other doctrine which is itself Divine. (2533.)

The latter proposition may also be stated as follows: *The Lord as Doctrine Is the Word Which Teaches.* Indeed, this teaching function is frequently emphasized in the Word itself: all prophecy and the spirit of prophecy, which the Lord's testimony is (Rev. XIX 10), is really a setting forth or teaching of God's Doctrine for the enlightenment and guidance of men. It is for this reason that the prophets mentioned in the Word represent this teaching, and in the highest sense the Divine Teacher, so that in the abstract sense a prophet signifies Doctrine itself, and thus also revelation. (2534.)

Doctrine as a guide of life may be applied to man's individual problems through the medium of prayer. The internal view of the subject matter of prayer opens the possibility of a certain influx into the perception or thought of the mind. If a man prays in the Lord's spirit of love and faith ("in His name," cf. XVI 23-4), and for heavenly and spiritual things, there then comes forth in the prayer something like a revelation manifested in the affection of the person praying in regard to hope, consolation, or a certain inward joy. It is through such individual application that the Doctrine acquires life; that Doctrine becomes of living interest. (2535-6.)

---

ing without their learning, or like casting seed upon a rock. The case is also the same with the angels who in the other life instruct the simple in heart. Although these angels are in celestial and spiritual wisdom, yet they do not hold themselves above the comprehension of those whom they teach, but speak in simplicity with them, yet rising by degrees as these are instructed; for if they were to speak from angelic wisdom, the simple would comprehend nothing at all, and thus would not be led to the truths and goods of faith. The case would be the same if the Lord had not taught in the Word in accordance with man's comprehension, in a rational manner. (2533-2.)

How are these general principles regarding the nature, authorship and application of Doctrine related and adjusted to man's rational and to his understanding? An antithesis at once presents itself. In so far as the human elements of sense experience, memory-knowledge and of rationalism are taken as the ground and basis of belief, so far the Doctrine becomes null and void. But in so far as Doctrine is believed a priori, i.e., without reference to those human elements, so far the Doctrine is real and living. It is that which is proper to the human that hinders the Divine influx and the reception of the Doctrine. To consult those human elements before believing the Doctrine is to weaken and nullify the latter. It is quite another thing, however, *to perceive the truth of Doctrine a priori, and then to confirm and corroborate it by means of things rational, of memory-knowledge, and of sense.* It is in this way that the Doctrine is maintained in its living integrity through the Divine that flows in. (2537-8.)

The Hierarchy of Life's Values.—(Gen. XX 8: Abimelech, rising early in the morning, calls his servants and tells them about the dream.) When the Doctrine of faith is viewed in the confirming light of truth that originates in the good of heavenly love, it becomes the subject of clear and distinct perception, in which the mental clearness and freshness is like that experienced in the morning hours in the world. It is then seen that if the mind and heart are set upon the celestial and spiritual values of the Lord's kingdom, all matters of Doctrine become precious. It is so, according to clear other-world observation, with the angelic citizens of that kingdom. Since, however, these things transcend the limited comprehension and outlook of the man who sets his mind and heart upon worldly and material things, the higher values which Doctrine teaches appear as unimportant, and as of no advantage to him.

Doctrine then calls for subordination of all lower levels of life to its celestial and spiritual principles, since these hold the first place by virtue of their Divine quality.* To

*Mt. VI 33: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His right-

these principles† rational things are to be subordinate; to these again memory-knowledges are to be subservient; and to the latter the things of sense are to be subordinate and subservient. The things which are subordinate are relatively servants, and are so called in the Word.

As the Lord embodied the Doctrine, He brought about the subordination spoken of in the sense that He reduced to obedience, not the rational things and the memory-knowledges themselves, but the affections that rose up against the celestial and spiritual principles of Doctrine, for on the subjugation of these the rational things and the memory-knowledges were reduced to subordination and into order.

This subordination and hierarchical arrangement moreover implies that rational things and memory-knowledges are called to confirm, illustrate and support the celestial and spiritual principles of Doctrine. On the part of the Lord—and of all those who follow Him—there is also involved a zeal for Doctrine, that it might be free from contamination by unenlightened reasoning and external knowledge. (2539-2543.)

(Gen. XX 9-10: Abimelech questions and rebukes Abraham.) The zeal for the purity of Doctrine is not without justification. The tendency on the part of rationalism and empirical learning (*rationale et scientificum*) to rise up and enter the realm of Doctrine constitutes a danger to the integrity of Doctrine; and any thought of allowing such a tendency is reprehensible. Doctrine is the formulation of the laws of order in the Lord's kingdom, and as such it is associated by correspondence with the analogous order in earthly kingdoms and nations, so that the danger confront-

---

eousness, and all these things shall be added unto you."

The priority of the discretely superior values of life was probably in Swedenborg's mind when he wrote this passage as inscription in his theological works.

†See examples given below, in the last section of this paper.

ing Doctrine is like the danger threatening a kingdom. This correspondential association is shown in the Word, which teaches that where true Doctrine is involved, the Lord will establish a lasting kingdom (Ezek. XXXVII 21-22; cf. Dan. VII 14), but that when falsities of Doctrine prevail, He permits wars and the destruction of kingdoms (Isaiah IX 7; XIX 2; Jerem. LI 19-20; Dan. II 37-46; VII 17-28; VIII 20-27; IX; Rev. XIV 8; XVII 10 foll.; XIX 19-21; XX 8-9).

The interest in, and the consideration of, such and similar matters concerning Doctrine is indeed a mark of celestial citizenship.* The clearness of perception required to grasp and thoroughly appreciate these matters of Doctrine is an angelic prerogative. The exposition of Doctrine concerning the Lord, His Divine and His Human, His glorification, and innumerable other matters of spiritual importance, in the serial order of the internal sense is especially adapted to angelic perception and thought.

They [the angels] are in their delightful, blessed and happy states, when they are thinking about the Lord, His Divine and His Human, and how the Human was made Divine; for they are encompassed with a celestial and spiritual sphere which is full of the Lord, so that it may be said that they are in the Lord. Hence nothing is more blessed to them than to think in accordance with the things that belong to that sphere and its derivative affection.

[The subjects of Doctrine] are presented before the angels in a celestial and spiritual manner, with thousands of representatives, in the light of life, when the Word is being read. But these things, which are so precious to the angels, are to men as of no importance, because above their comprehension, and thus in the shade of their understanding. Thus, wonderful to say, the things that come into shade with man, and almost into contempt, with the angels pass into light, and into their affection, as is the case with many things of the internal sense of the Word. (2544-2551; cf. 2540.)

The Integrity of Doctrine, and the Human Rational.— (Gen. XX 11-13: Abraham answers that he feared for his life for the sake of Sarah as his wife. Sarah was also his half-sister, and she had agreed to pass as such after leaving

**Angelicum est de illis in tali serie cogitare.* (2551.)

the ancestral home, and following her marriage to Abraham.) The question to be answered, then, resolves itself into this: How can the celestial-spiritual purity and integrity of Doctrine be maintained in the face of the danger arising from the necessary adaptation to man's materialistic and rationalistic thought? For it is to be remembered that

> Man cannot apprehend any Doctrine that is purely spiritual and celestial, that is, Divine, because it infinitely transcends his apprehension, and thus also his belief. All man's thoughts are terminated in the natural things which are connected with his senses. Whatever is not said from and according to these natural things is not comprehended, but perishes, like sight that has no bound in some ocean or universe; and therefore if doctrinal matters were set forth before a man in any other manner, they would not be received at all, and no respect would be entertained for them, as may be sufficiently evident from everything in the Word, where for this very reason purely Divine things themselves are set forth naturally, and even sensuously; as that Jehovah has ears, eyes, and a face; and that He has feelings like a man, such as anger, and so forth. (2553.)

It was just the Lord's insight into this materialistic trend of thought that led to the consideration of man's rational and its relation to Doctrine, and this for the sake of man's salvation and the preservation of the Word, the repository of Doctrine.

The answer to the above question, evolved in the clearness of the Lord's perception as a logical conclusion of the foregoing train of thought, and yet given in accordance with man's state, is along the following lines:

The celestial-spiritual integrity of Doctrine lies in the connubial union of Divine Love or Good—receivable as celestial love or good—with Divine Wisdom or Truth—receivable as spiritual truth (cf. 2508). The reception of Divine-celestial love or good, absolutely necessary for eternal life, is immediately secured through apprehension and appreciation of spiritual truth; but if, as is usually the case, men have no regard for spiritual truth, celestial love, and with it spiritual life, would perish but for one fact, as follows:

Although the Divine Good is united [by marriage] to the Divine Truth alone, it nevertheless flows into lower truths, and conjoins itself with them, but not as by a marriage; for it flows into rational truths which are only appearances of truth, and conjoins itself with them, and it flows even into truths of sense and of memory-knowledge, which are scarcely anything but fallacies, and conjoins itself with these. Unless this were so, no man could possibly have been saved (see 1831-2). That the Divine Good might be conjoined with truths of reason and of memory-knowledge, and that man might thus be saved, was the purpose of the Lord's coming into the world. (2552-4.)

The further explanation of this lies in the constitution of man's rational mind, which is conceived of celestial love or good as a father and of the affection of knowledges empirically acquired, as a mother, and in the consequent conjunction, through the rational as a medium, of spiritual truth with celestial good. (2555-2563.)

Priority of Doctrine.—(Gen. XX 14-16: Abimelech gives of his possessions to Abraham, and opens the country to him, as he restores Sarah his wife; the special gift of silver is to be "a covering of the eyes.")

Genuine order requires that the supreme principles of life be appreciated *per se,* and that all inferior values be regarded from those principles. If, in accordance with genuine order, the Doctrine of faith is perceived as a supreme or Divine principle from which rational and natural values of life are to be regarded, the Doctrine is found to be living and greatly enriched with such values. The priority of Doctrine to all human rationalizations is essential for all true, mental perspective of life, and consequently for all enlightenment, intelligence and wisdom.

Indeed, any Doctrine is necessarily based on certain principles, so that for sound Doctrine there must be sound and positive principles. They who think from such high and sound principles as here implied can confirm themselves by whatever rational considerations and by whatever knowledges and whatever philosophical theorems they have at command; for all these are to them things confirmatory, and give them a fuller idea of the matter.

Reasoning according to Doctrine then is, as a general rule, one of perspective from supreme principles, and of descent thence to rational and natural levels. Indeed, any inverse method is impossible; no one can ascend and apprehend higher things from lower ones, because higher things transcend the understanding which always terminates in natural and sensuous things; any attempt in that direction necessarily involves principles that lack genuine enlightenment, and which then inevitably vitiate all conclusions arrived at, and so lead to folly and insanity.

> The more they who think from a negative principle consult things rational, the more they consult memory-knowledges, and the more they consult things philosophical, the more do they cast and precipitate themselves into darkness, until at last they deny all things. (2564-9.)

The Living Value of Doctrine—Perspective.—The wealth and variety of Doctrine appears as a reflexion of man's spiritual progress. When a man becomes spiritual and celestial, he then no longer thinks from truth but from good or love. As a result the Doctrine which hitherto appeared as the Doctrine of faith now is seen and appreciated as the Doctrine of love and charity, although regarded in itself the Doctrine of faith is identical with it. This new aspect of Doctrine points to a variety and depth of Doctrine that is in complete agreement with its Divine authorship (cf. 2516, 2531). Indeed, the Lord, perceiving and thinking from the supreme principle of Divine Love, has such a view of Doctrine, so that *the Doctrine of Love and Charity is the Divine Doctrine itself.*

This living value of Doctrine, which enters into every man's life as a spiritual essential, is of special interest in an important respect. Doctrine involves not only truth, or the form of living reality; it involves also good, or love, as the very essence of the highest reality. The truth of Doctrine is faith; the good of Doctrine is love and charity. Now, it is from good of Doctrine that its truth is seen; for good in its highest form is the supreme life principle, and to see from

the first principle or from the highest end and cause, is to see from a lofty standpoint upon all things that are below.

To use a comparison, this is like one who is on a high mountain, in a watch-tower, who is able to look around for many miles upon the things below; while they who are below, especially if they are in a valley or in a forest, can scarcely see as many paces. Precisely so is it with those who are in the good of Doctrine, in comparison with those who are in the truth of Doctrine separated from its good; although the latter think that they see farther than the former. Nevertheless these see nothing of good, not anything of truth except very slightly on the surface, and even this defiled by falsities. (2572.)

In other words, good of Doctrine is superior not only to simple, unqualified good, especially as it is found in children; it is also above all mere intellectualism. It is one thing to be in good simply, and quite another to be in the good of Doctrine. Any one may be in simple or apparent good, but only those who have been regenerated by doctrinal truths of faith are in the good of Doctrine. It is they who from the Lord are in the very principles or springs of things,* and who may enjoy such a wide mental perspective as illustrated above. This becomes apparent in the angelic state, in which love, focussed in the Lord and mutually shared, unfolds a mental panorama of truth, and thus of wisdom and intelligence, not only in regard to celestial and spiritual things, but also in regard to rational and natural things.

The range of such a mental perspective, although finite, is very great. In the Lord's case, however, in which God is the very Esse of all human and angelic good of Doctrine, and thus the Esse itself of wisdom and intelligence, the range becomes infinite, so that in comparison with it man's or even the angel's mental perspective, imposing and elevating as it seems, is scarcely anything. (2570-2.)

Reflexive Reference to Spiritual Truth.—(Gen. XX 16: "And unto Sarah he said, Behold, I have given thy brother a thousand of silver; behold it is unto thee a covering of the eyes to all that are with thee, and with all; and she was

**In ipsis principiis seu fontibus rerum.*

vindicated.") Since order calls for our perceptive acknowledgment of the superior values of life as represented in Doctrine, with consequent mental view or perspective of lower life values, including rational truths and natural facts of life, it remains to be seen how man, bound as he is by routine to such lower values, can nevertheless free himself and adopt a higher point of view. After all, any actual perception flowing from spiritual truth is beyond human ken: it is the Lord's Divine prerogative. What, however, is both possible and required of man is an acknowledgment of the superior values of Doctrine as a matter of principle, and consequent regeneration by means of truths of faith; the higher point of view, with the mental perspective, will then develop automatically. In the light of that acknowledgment of the spiritual truth involved in Doctrine, it will then be seen that all rational truths and all lower truths derived from them (memory truths and sensuous truths) are simply a covering or clothing to spiritual truths. The latter, too refined to be seen by themselves, are *veiled* by appearances of rational and lower truths, and thus removed from harm's reach.

The constant importance of this arrangement is seen from the fact that such appearances of truth, in a graded series corresponding to various discrete levels of life, are treated of in the Word, especially under the representation of the veils or curtains in Israel's tent at the time of Moses (Exodus XXVI-XXVII; XXXVI-XXXVIII). The emphasis on the intrinsically spiritual character and aspect of Doctrine is significatively and yet clearly made in such prophetic utterances as Isaiah LII 1-2; LXI 10, as well as by the Lord revealing Himself through St. John (Rev. III 4-5; IV 4), and through His forerunner John the Baptist, concerning the bright garments worn in kings' houses (Mt. XI 8; Lk. VII 25). The zeal for Doctrine and for truth, especially in the case of their violation, was spiritually implied by the Israelitish custom of rending one's garments (Josh. VII 6; Judges XI 35; I Sam. IV 12, etc.), this custom representing the violence done to Doctrine. The

Lord's combative zeal for Doctrine is moreover shown in the classical passage of Isaiah LXIII 1-3. (2573-2578.)

The Final Status of Doctrine.—(Gen. XX 17-18: Abraham intercedes through prayer for Abimelech, and God heals the latter and restores the fertility of the women of Abimelech's household.) The status of the Doctrine of faith depends ultimately on the position and point of view from which it is regarded. If Doctrine is regarded from the Lord, and therefore from the sublime point of view of Divine Truth, it is a real revelation, thoroughly sound in respect to good as well as to truth, and in all joyful affections involving doctrinal interests. In this view an abundance of new good and truth is conceived from the Lord's Divine, and amply confirmed by each and all things, both of reason and of memory. It is from this that all intelligence and wisdom is derived. If, however, Doctrine is regarded from man's own point of view, that is, from his rational mind and from the appearances and fallacies of his limited knowledge and experience, then nothing of good and nothing of truth is conceived, and all authority of doctrinal truth fades and gives way to folly and insanity. (2579-2584.)

The final answer to the question as to whether it is allowable to enter into the proper domain of Doctrine from and by means of rational matters, in order to form for one's self ideas concerning it, is from the Lord's perception from the Divine, and is to the effect that Doctrine is really a matter of Divine Revelation, and therefore not to be entered in the manner suggested by the question. Doctrine is Divinely conceived from supreme Good as a Father,* and born by Truth as a Mother.† To first enter the Divine domain of Doctrine from one's rational, thereby associating the latter with that holy domain, is to deny and prevent the Divine conception of Doctrine, and also the actual birth, and the consequent conjunction of spiritual truth with celes-

*Hence the name "Jehovah."

†Hence the use of the name "God."

tial good. A spiritual barrenness would be the result. (2585-8/1.)

Doctrine then is a matter of revelation, and the correct and orderly approach to its domain is from this point of view. Doctrine and its principles are good and true a priori, i.e., from the Divine; so that in relation to these celestial and spiritual principles of Doctrine, all rational and all natural values are subordinate. From the point of view of Doctrine these inferior matters constitute the confirmatory or corroborative material, and the function proper to man's rational faculty is, in this view, to maintain *the ratio*‡ or relation of this confirmatory material to the principles of Doctrine. It is in and through this truly rational function of subordinating rational thought as well as general knowledge and experience that man is really enlightened, and his thought and his ideas strengthened. Indeed, man's enlightenment is secured by means of reason and knowledge. With those who are thus enlightened,

> The Doctrine thus "living lives," and of them it is said that they are healed, and "bring forth"; whereas with those who are in the negative the Doctrine "dying dies," and it is said of them that "the womb closing is closed." (2588-2.)

The approach to Doctrine from the superior point of view of revelation, and the subsequent confirmation of Doctrine by means of rational thought and general knowledge and experience, are seen to be in accordance with universal order. This is most clearly seen when presented in its contrast to the method of approaching Doctrine from a merely rational point of view, as illustrated by the following examples.

EXAMPLE I. From the superior point of view of revelation, *The First Principle of Doctrine Is Love to the Lord and toward the Neighbor.*

When this is recognized *a priori,* it is according to order to canvass whatever things of reason, memory, and experi-

‡Hence the very term, "rational." Cf. "The Soul," nn. 342; 367-369.

ence are available or accessible, and this by every individual according to his ability, knowledge, and experience. The more thoroughly the canvass is conducted, the more completely is the Doctrine confirmed.

The canvass of rational and empirical material for the confirmation of the principles of Doctrine is therefore free, and limited only by our individual ability and outlook. The canvass is generally along two distinct lines: (1) rational considerations; (2) canvass of general knowledge and experience for illustrative material.*

The first principle of Doctrine, as above defined, may then be confirmed (1) on the rational ground that life is such as to find satisfaction in a goal attained through the efficient use of life's powers. For, since the basic power of life is love, and the highest and all-inclusive type of love is love to the Lord as the love of responding to, and cooperating with, the Lord's Divine Love toward all mankind, therefore the goal of life is attained in its highest sense in the efficient use or function of love to the Lord, and consequent charity toward the neighbor.†

(2) The same doctrinal principle may be confirmed on the further ground of biological and general knowledge. Life is a continuous adjustment of an individual to its environment. On a low biological level, as with one-celled animals, such adjustment takes very primitive forms. On higher biological levels, that adjustment assumes more complex and more efficient forms; and in the case of men it becomes further diversified as the various fields of life and endeavor are opened up to him,— the economical, vocational, recreational, civil, moral, and spiritual. The varied forms of adjustment, gradually developed, involve certain principles of procedure, or "free ideas," which in turn in-

*Since the author does not give a specific confirmation of this principle, the writer of this paper hereby essays a confirmation of his own, along the two lines just indicated, in the next two paragraphs.

†This consideration is suggested by a study of E. M. L. Gould's "Business of Living," chapters VII and VIII.

volve, as their first essential, our ability to place ourselves in the position of our fellow men, to consider their point of view, in order to live in harmony with them. When this ability is applied in an impartial spirit, and we come to regard both ourselves and our fellow men not from a personal or subjective viewpoint but from a general yet truly and intensely human point of view which is identical with the Lord's Divine Human, then we have that central vantage ground on which our adjustment to our environment takes the form of love to the Lord, and of consequent charity toward the neighbor.

This first doctrinal principle, thus shown to be capable of ample confirmation, cannot be persistently denied except from a heart that has hardened itself against the truth of Doctrine and its spirit of love and charity, and by a mind that all the time takes its stand in favor of some other principle which it believes to be essential. As that first doctrinal principle requires an impartial yet intensely human spirit of love and charity, any other principle set up in opposition to it must somehow involve a merely subjective point of view, most especially the notion that the only love that carries any delight or "thrill" is the love of self and of the world. (2588/3.)

Example II. From the superior point of view of revelation, the Doctrine teaches as a primary article of faith that *All Good Is from the Lord, and All Evil from Man's Own Self.*

Recognition of this article of Doctrine *a priori* leads to the rational consideration that genuine good, free from any mercenary implications, cannot possibly flow in from any other source than Good Itself, that is, from the Fountain of Good, thus from the Lord.

A further canvass of corroborative material leads to illustrations, and these are found in all things that are truly good, in ourselves and our fellow men, in the community and in the world in general, and this especially in view of the fact, already briefly noted, that from a merely rational point of view, and guided by merely natural, unregenerated

impulses, man tends toward selfishness, and so toward what is inherently evil.

This article of Doctrine then is also confirmed, and it is significant that all opposition and negation to it arises from the mere appearance that good is in man as if originally his own, and moreover betrays a deep ignorance of the intrinsic nature of genuine celestial and spiritual good, by which all lower good is made alive, and thus carries true delight. (2588/4.)

EXAMPLE III. The Doctrine teaches the truth that *They Who Are Imbued with the Principle of Love and Charity* (see Example I) *Are Capable of Receiving the Truths of Doctrine and Consequently Faith, Whereas Those Who Are Steeped in the Love of Self and of the World, and Consequently in the Delight of Evil, Can Never Receive Doctrine.*

Rational confirmation of this is on the ground that truth and good agree, but not truth and evil. Good, especially the good of Doctrine, involves the very principles of things, and therefore constitutes a lofty and central vantage ground which affords a grand perspective (see above at 2570-2572), whereas, on the other hand, evil, or the perversion of good, when made subservient to mercenary and selfish purposes, gradually but inevitably limits one's mental view to a merely subjective outlook (see Example I, last paragraph).

Illustration of this is seen wherever truths of Doctrine, once recognized, separate* evils, whereas evils spew out truths. Persons who apply the truths of Doctrine are perfected in them, while those who live contrary to them lose their hold on them.

Those who deny this, asserting and arguing that everyone regardless of character and manner of life is able to believe truth, nevertheless become themselves living examples and illustrations of this truth of Doctrine. As they

*Literally, "flee evils": *Quod vera fugiant mala.* An apt illustration is the following from the "Annals of the New Church," pp. 112-113: A.D. 1779. *"Norrköping.* A society of New-Churchmen, with Charles B. Wadström at the head, is organized here for the purpose of agitating against the African slave-trade. This great movement thus has its origin in the New Church."

come to reject for themselves all genuine good of life, they finally lose even their faith altogether. (2588/5.)

EXAMPLE IV. The Doctrine teaches that *The Word Has Been So Written as to Possess an Internal Sense Which Does Not Appear in the Letter.*

Confirmation by rational considerations takes into account man's citizenship in both worlds, the natural and the spiritual. For the maintenance of this double citizenship, the Word as revelation that has come down through heaven is the proper medium; so that the Word itself must in its heavenly origin concern itself with purely spiritual things, which are related to the contents of the sense of the letter not by similarity but only by correspondence.

Additional confirmation of this is by known facts of ancient literature. In the ancient or pre-Advent dispensations the literature was characterized by a representative style which had come to be revered as holy and as learned in the ancient East. Examples are the still extant books of many well-known authors of the ancient Orient, of Hellas and of Rome.

Those who are in a negative attitude, if they do not openly deny these things, show an apparent tolerance which is really ill-concealed indifference.* (2588/6.)

EXAMPLE V. The following matter of knowledge *(scientificum)* with which Doctrine is directly concerned, is to present a plainer view of the issue involved: *Sight Is Not of the Eye, But of the Spirit, Which Sees Natural Objects Through the Eye as a Bodily Organ.*

Confirmation of this teaching is found in the fact that we visualize not only things seen, but also things heard, and even subjects of thought and of imagination. The act of

*If further pressed, such confirmed deniers of spiritual truth plead the exigencies of practical affairs as being more urgent than abstract considerations of Doctrine. The fallacy of this argument, easy as it is to see and to demonstrate in view of the priority of spiritual and superior life values over material and inferior ones, is not, however, recognized by such confirmed abnegators and agnostics.

visualizing is seen to involve an interior sight as the sight of the spirit within the body, enabling men as spiritual beings to see innumerable things in the other life. This view is supported by the fact that in dreams, especially in the prophetic dreams recorded in the Word, many things have been seen although not with the bodily eyes. Moreover, philosophic thought may be enlisted, considering that:

outer things cannot enter into inner things, just as compounds cannot into simples, and therefore that the things of the body cannot enter into those of the spirit, but only the reverse. Not to mention a host of other proofs, until at last the man is persuaded that the spirit has sight, and not the eye, except from the spirit. (2588-7.)

Yet even to this there is a negative attitude, attributing the undisputed facts to merely natural causes, or else to mere fancy, and ridiculing all teaching concerning the reality of things not seen with the bodily eye. It is plain that such negation arises from a cynic materialism confirmed in a hardened heart, rather than from a sincere desire for truth for truth's sake. (2588/7.)

Conclusion. Since Doctrine is true *a priori,* it is according to order to consider first its truth on its own merit, and then to enter into the domain of the rational for corroboration, and finally into the field of general knowledge for illustration. When this is done we are enlightened, and there is opened to the mind's eye an immense and almost unbounded field. The orderly character of this method is indirectly proved by the fact that the opposite procedure of entering into the domain of Doctrine from that of the rational and of memory-knowledge, renders man blind even to the most commonplace truths, and finally insane, as he hardens himself against the truths of Doctrine from the Word. It is this that we are warned against, while every encouragement is given to him who is endowed with talent and knowledge to cultivate the rational faculty by means of knowledge, in order to confirm the truths of Doctrine which superior perception has once* ascertained to be genuine.

Paul Hartley.

*The "Arcana" makes here particular reference to the perceptive findings of the Most Ancient Church. (2588-15.)

SWEDENBORG'S USE OF SCRIPTURE FOR DOCTRINE. II.

Broad Foundations in Scripture for His Method

By the Rev. William F. Wunsch

BY a full century Swedenborg anticipated the general method of employing Scripture for theology which is now the current practice. Instead of building on existing doctrinal formulations, and erecting a teaching independently, for which he employed Scripture only in substantiation, he went to Scripture as his source, and drew his doctrine in the first place from what he called "the sense of the letter of the Word." It was the teaching of the Word which he wished to formulate, and to this end a search of Scripture was in order, and the collation of all its teaching on a given subject. Substantiating this teaching from Scripture naturally became a second and secondary step, and was also entirely feasible then and widely possible. As handled by him, the method breathed the spirit of scientific inquiry, which was also the spirit that inspired the method so many years later in theology generally. Definitely, if not consciously, Swedenborg forsook the proof-text method in theological work, which began with a doctrine formulated from elsewhere, and which had recourse to Scripture only for confirmation by texts taken indifferently from any part of the Bible.*

We have now to consider how the Scriptures lend themselves to use under this method for the formulation of a single theology from them. What unity do they possess which gives hope of drawing a unified body of teaching from them? It is easy of course to postulate such unity in Scripture. It is easy to say that inasmuch as the Word is the expression ultimately of one Divine mind, it must have

*So a first paper (New-Church Review, April, 1933, p. 78) tried to show.

unity, however deeply buried this unity is. But this is hardly sufficient for active use of Scripture in the formulation of its teaching. The theological workman must actually behold the unity.

As we took note in the previous paper, the close student does not find the same scheme of theology expressed everywhere in Scripture. He finds one theology in one book of the Bible, another theology in another book. Even the Gospels vary in their theology, and on so central a subject as the doctrine of the Person of Christ. But while this is true of historical theological study, it is not true, as we also pointed out, or it is not the whole truth, for the systematic theologian. The historical student naturally takes his station here or there in Scripture, and reports what the theology of a given book of Scripture was in its day. His purpose demands of him that he record and report any and every view and insight, the outgrown as well as the freshly attained and valid. He finally presents us, therefore, with diverse biblical theologies. The systematic theologian, on the other hand, has for his object the teaching of Scripture at its point of fullest development, redeeming and formative of the spiritual life now. Positions and insights which have been left behind in the progress of revelation, while they are of historical interest, are not to be incorporated into living doctrine. That is, the unity found in Scripture for the formulation of a consistent teaching from it is not to be found in the statements of Scripture, but in the process of revelation reflected in the statements. Apprehend the Bible statically, and much in it must be arrayed against much else. A picture of God as a tribal deity is at variance with a representation of the one living God of all the world. But penetrate to the stream of onward-travelling revelation in Scripture, and follow its course, and the idea of tribal deity falls away before insight into universal Deity. Following up this progress of revelation in the pages of the Bible, we see emerging a unity of thought and intent—a unity wrought out in the very course and movement of revelation.

The systematic theologian today arrives at a sufficient unity in Scripture for his purposes by reliance upon the concept of progressive revelation. Do we mean to say that this outlook on Scripture was also anticipated by Swedenborg?

Essentially, even if not so designated, I think we can say that the modern concept of progressive revelation was present to Swedenborg's thought.

At points in Scripture, it is true, where we today would say that revelation had moved from an earlier insight to a better, Swedenborg is likely to speak of contradiction between passages, as though revelation spoke at one and the same time in one way and the other. He arrays a Scripture which depicts God as changeful against one which represents Him as incapable of "repenting." He cites a number of verbally contradictory Scripture passages in "Sacred Scripture," n. 51, where his point is that, for a number of reasons, the teaching of Scripture needs systematization or cannot be understood without doctrine. The same seemingly static way of regarding Scripture and expectation of unity among its statements, and the same evidence of an absence of the concept of progressive revelation, are apparently reflected in the declaration, "The literal sense is such that in many places it appears opposed to itself" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3451 (3e)).

And yet, in its broad outlines, the concept of progressive revelation is far from new. The idea is as old as the Lord's words, "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time . . . : but I say unto you" (*Matthew* v). It is as old as Paul's position, that with the New Testament a regime of law gave place to a regime of grace. It is as old as the general Christian feeling and conviction, that in the transition from the Old Testament to the New there was a deepening and a further unfolding of truth. The idea was even older, and is to be glimpsed in Isaiah's words:

> But the Word of the Lord was unto them precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, there a little (xxviii. 13).

There is reason to say that Swedenborg recognized this gradual unfolding of truth and the supercession of earlier insights and standards by later and better. In a noteworthy paragraph in the "Arcana Cœlestia," n. 9349, he lists elements in the very law from Sinai which with the New Testament ceased to have any force, and still other elements which have ceased to be obligations to the Christian of today. In "Apocalypse Explained," n. 948, there is a sweeping recognition of the progressiveness of revelation.

> At the end of the (Jewish) Church, or when the Lord came into the world, the Word was interiorly opened. Interior Divine truths were revealed by the Lord, which were to serve a new Church to be established by Him, and which did so serve it.

Indeed, he proceeds in the same passage to rest his own work as Revelator on this concept of progressive revelation.

> What took place at the end of the Jewish Church has taken place similarly now. . . . Today again, and for like reasons, the Word has been interiorly opened, and Divine truths have been revealed still more interior, which are to serve a new Church, which will be called the New Jerusalem.

Swedenborg posits a progress of revelation, then, within the pages of the Bible, and as between Old Testament and New, and again as between the giving of the Word and the disclosure of still deeper meaning in it.

Besides having before him the concept of progressive revelation, Swedenborg has his own way of following up the movement of revelation in the pages of the Bible. Regularly he discriminates in his doctrinal material in the Bible between "genuine truth" and "apparent truth." We may recur to the passage quoted above from the "Arcana Cœlestia." In that passage he defines apparent truths as "truths accommodated to those who are in externals, consequently in worldly and even corporeal loves." "Apparent truths" are truths as apprehended by those whose senses dominate their thought, by those in self-regard, by men of low moral standard or of a sub-Christian insight. The Divine aversion to evil, for example, seems to the wrongdoer suffering the consequences of a misdeed, to be anger and even a punitive spirit. Thus does the Scripture often

state the truth of the Divine aversion to evil. The "genuine truth" was often stated, too, where the insight was asserted that there is no vengeance or anger in God. The apparent truth is then outworn insight; genuine truth is the insight which has come in the progress of revelation. Obviously the discrimination between the two was a means of following up the movement of revelation in Scripture. It operated in Swedenborg's formulation of the Scripture's teaching as the principle of progressive revelation does with the contemporary workman in this field.

The objection can be urged against such discrimination in doctrinal material in the Bible, that it is a procedure dangerously open to subjective and personal judgment. What a man's system of teaching can assimilate he could call "genuine truth," and what it refuses, "apparent truth." But there is a norm outside oneself to govern all such discrimination. The Christian theologian takes this norm perforce to guide him. Luther's test ("rechter Prüfestein") of a Scripture was whether or not it testified to Christ. Broadly apprehended, this is necessarily the norm of any teaching which can call itself Christian. What is plainly sub-Christian in the Old Testament, and of course what is divergent from the mind of Christ as this is disclosed in the Gospels, cannot be actively employed for Christian theology. What stands accredited in the light of Christ, is to be used. The statement is frequently made in the Theological Works," the Lord is doctrine." This pronouncement has many meanings, some of them deeply philosophical, some of them profoundly spiritual and involving the substance of theology. But one meaning involved bears upon the method of theology. This is, that the criterion of the Word's teaching for the Christian is agreement with and reflection of the mind and spirit of the Lord. Attaching this significance to the pronouncement, we see new meaning, too, in Swedenborg's assertion that the doctrines he set forth he had "from the Lord alone" while he read the Word (True Christian Religion, n. 779e).

The presence of the idea of progressive revelation to Swedenborg's thought can thus be shown from the implication of

it in his method. We venture to illustrate the point, too, from one of his results, though this result would today invite a challenge from biblical criticism. This is Swedenborg's reliance upon the Johannine Christology in his teaching about the Person of Christ. The viewpoints of the different Gospels in their pictures of the Person of Christ are different; the pictures themselves are different. It cannot be said that Swedenborg entered into the differences. There is no word of them in the Theological Works. On the other hand, I do not think that it can be said that the outlook or emphasis of any one of the Gospels upon the Person of the Lord is lost from or disregarded in the Christology which Swedenborg draws from the total Gospel. But tacitly, too, he treats the Fourth Gospel as the summation of New Testament revelation on the Person of Christ. He utilized the Johannine teaching for his Christology as the fullest development of the doctrine to be found in the New Testament. What was this but to move with what historically was the movement of insight on the subject? It is as though he had said, in the face of an historical criticism of the Gospel which has come since his day, "Whether the words of the Fourth Gospel depicting the nature of Christ are strictly Christ's words or more usually Christ's as interpreted by John, the interpretation came under the promised tuition of the Spirit, and represents the view of the Lord's Person which was bound to come in the Church's growing thought about the Master."

The unity of Scripture then for Swedenborg the Revelator as for the modern theologian in the use of Scripture for doctrine consisted not in a unity among standing statements, but in the unity of the truth into which the Scripture has moved in the progress of revelation.

Obviously then, and most obviously in view of the discrimination between "genuine truth" and "apparent" in Scripture, the use of Scripture for theology did not mean for Swedenborg, any more than it does for the contemporary workman, a use of everything in Scripture. We

need to consider or at least note some other discriminations which Swedenborg makes.

It is hardly necessary to say that there is a large amount of Scripture which has no doctrinal content whatever. Historical narrative, ordinary conversation, ancient legislation, genealogies, descriptions of nature, etc., hold no significance for the theologian, and give him no material. This is a common-sense discrimination which is never absent from the Theological Works. When Swedenborg is expounding the spiritual sense of the Word, he utilizes every word of Scripture, for he finds that sense pervading every word of Scripture. But when he is formulating doctrine from Scripture, he must discriminatingly find and assemble his material, for not all Scripture has doctrinal content or significance. Not even what has doctrinal content can all be used by him, as we saw; "apparent truth," or truth as it once appeared to writer or spokesman, cannot be directly utilized. "There are in the sense of the letter of the Word many things which cannot be made available as doctrine for the Church today" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 356). How emphatic on the point the words are which we italicize in the following passage!

> The Word is said to be closed when it is understood solely as to the sense of the letter, and *when all that is in this sense is taken for doctrine.* (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3769.)

Further statements to the same point will be found in the same work, nn. 8972(2), 9349, 10637.

Again, Scripture which is itself doctrinal formulation, cannot be drawn upon as other Scripture can be. This is the explanation of Swedenborg's attitude toward the Epistles, for example. The reason is not that he confines himself in the formulation of doctrine to those books of the Bible which he says have a spiritual sense or deeper meaning than the literal. For one thing, doctrine is to come from the sense of the letter; and he plainly employs the Scriptures at large in his doctrinal works. In such a work as the "Arcana," expounding the Word's spiritual sense, he confines himself to Scriptures having a spiritual sense. In such

a work, however, as the "True Christian Religion," formulating doctrine, he employs books with a spiritual sense and books without that sense. The difference in his procedure with Gospels and with Epistles arises from the fact that the latter are already in good part a formulation of doctrine. Paul's Epistles, as he says, are "doctrinal books" themselves. Swedenborg can adopt their teaching, or reject it, or use it in some illustrative way; as, for instance, he adopts and frequently quotes the formula, "In Jesus Christ the Godhead dwelleth bodily." The Epistles strictly do not offer source material as the Gospels do. It is true that the Fourth Gospel, in which, as we said, Swedenborg finds the fullest Christological teaching, is itself highly reflective writing, already entering the field of formulation, and yet in its underlying substance, in quotation of the Lord's words, interpreted though these are, it is still offering material for formulation. Swedenborg's doctrine of the Person of Christ also extends decisively beyond the Johannine teaching. Paul, in contrast with John, is definitely launched on doctrinal formulation. Distinguishing Scriptures, then, which offer source material for theology from Scriptures which are already formulation of material, Swedenborg draws actively on Gospels and Revelation, citing as accordant or illustrative formulation Epistles and other early formulation of Christian doctrine.

The unity of Scripture for theological use allows all the foregoing discriminations to be made in the material it offers. That unity does not mean, either, that all the Scripture which is available for doctrine is of uniform value. For Swedenborg there is not only the discrimination into "genuine truth" and "apparent truth," but I think we can say that in what he calls or would call genuine truth he sees gradations, as of course the contemporary theologian does. Early patriarchal grasp of a truth is not to be ranked with prophetic, nor with New Testament apprehension. There was much that was true and profound in the early Old Testament conceptions of God, but the prophetic conceptions of God surpassed them in every way. To the Samaritan

woman at the well and to her fellow-religionists, who cherished only the Pentateuch, the Lord could say that salvation was of the Jews (who cherished the Prophets) and that "we know what we worship." Swedenborg puts this fact of varied insight in terms, however, of varied accommodation on the part of God. God spoke as men were able to hear. The lack of uniform value in the doctrinal material of the Bible, or Swedenborg's recognition of that lack, is to be found in his doctrine of accommodated Scriptures.

A further fact needs only to be stated. Comprehensive use of the Scriptures for theology does not mean that all Scripture can be drawn upon for a given doctrine. This is obvious. Little if any of the Old Testament can be utilized for the doctrine of the Second Coming. The Old Testament predicts a Coming, without differentiating it into a First and a Second. If what the Old Testament says of the Lord's Coming, ever has to do with the Second Advent, this is owing to the fact that its picture of the Coming is not wholly realized in the First Coming, but waits for fulfilment until a Second. The student of "True Christian Religion" may call attention to Swedenborg's citation of *Daniel* both on the back of the title-page and in the chapter on the Second Coming. Here we need to bear in mind that Swedenborg cites Scripture in two ways. Sometimes he does so as an example of the Scripture from which he is drawing a doctrine. At other times, he is citing the passage for the light or detail which its spiritual sense furnishes for a doctrine. It is for light from the deeper sense, that he is citing *Daniel* in connection with the subject of the Second Coming; he is not drawing that doctrine from the historical or literal meaning of *Daniel*. To illustrate further that one is confined to Scriptures having to do with a doctrine in formulating that doctrine even *comprehensively* from Scripture, it is the Synoptic Gospels which afford material for the doctrine of the Second Coming, and chiefly the Lord's own words, in *Mark* xiii and parallels. The Fourth Gospel is not pertinent; close examination reveals that it has to do not with a further Coming of the Son of man, but

with the gift of the Spirit, which is a culmination of the *First* Advent.

Swedenborg had one aid to descrying the deep unity in Scripture which does not come within the purview of the general theologian today. This is the Word's deeper meaning. We cannot discuss at this point whether there is such a content in Scripture; but, granted that there is, it is plain that this could give Scripture a unity which it might not otherwise have. To Swedenborg the unity in Scripture is as deep-lying as this. He has this sense in mind when he declares, "Seen in its own light the Word contains no contradictions" (Sacred Scripture, n. 51). He says further,

> When the truths [of the spiritual sense] are in a man, the sense of the letter cannot be perverted. For the sense of the letter may be turned in any direction. (True Christian Religion, n. 207.)

> The knowledges of the Church at the present day are those which belong to the literal sense of the Word. Unless truths from the internal sense are introduced into these knowledges, the mind may be led off into every heresy, but it cannot be so diverted when these truths are introduced. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 6071.)

How the spiritual sense helps towards this unification, and what in general the rôle of that sense is in the formulation of doctrine from the Word will be considered more fully in our next paper, describing with some closeness Swedenborg's method of using Scripture for doctrine.

We have tried to show how in the unevenness and doctrinal diversity of Scripture Swedenborg could yet hope to educe from it a unified body of doctrine. The unity in Scripture, which invites such theological effort, lies deep in Scripture—it is not a consensus of statements so much as it is a unity on which the process of revelation from every side converges. It is a unity wrought out in the progress of revelation, and is reached by the individual doctrinal workman through ability to follow the unfolding of truth, and by the many discriminations which must be made in the material to his hand.

William F. Wunsch.

INVESTMENTS FOR THE FUTURE OF THE CHURCH*

By Carolyn Allison Blackmer

THERE is a striking parallel between our present economic condition and the spiritual depression in the Church that suggests that both are ultimations on different planes of the same forces. On every side we hear expressions of anxiety about the continuance of our established institutions, our church societies. In the midst of a great wealth of truths, there is a poverty of truths with our children, in our homes and marriages, and in our schools. We see vast resources of wealth wasted or neglected through our own indifference or lack of ability to put them to use. With the tremendous amount of work to be done, our employment is cut short by the lack of circulation of truths. There is grave question in our minds whether we have made wise investments in the past of the spiritual funds committed to our care; the returns have been so meager. When the luxuries of complacency are taken from us, we are appalled by the dullness and mediocrity that have taken hold of us. We feel impelled to find a way back to the states when there was a distinction, nobility and zeal accompanying the loneliness of the pioneer days of the New Church. This is indeed the moment for taking stock, reckoning our losses, and making investments for the future that are insured against the greed of a selfhood that works without the Lord. This is indeed the time for spiritual reconstruction.

Once we have examined ourselves with honesty and found ourselves lacking, we must not remain in despair. There is no unemployment here; there is wonderful work to do. The Lord has given us tools for high uses in our capacities as

*A paper read before the National Alliance of New-Church Women at Philadelphia on May 19th, 1933.

women. See how He has given us the capacity for receiving new life, protecting it in its tender growth, bringing it forth even in pain and travail with courage. So much of our time and thought is given to the care of homes that protect that new life: the preparing of food to nourish it, the sweeping away of the clutter of disorder, the adorning of rooms with the beauty and loveliness that grow out of our marriages!

Here is a work that is rightfully ours: in receiving and bringing forth new life in our spiritual home, the Church. What changes we might bring about, what depths of disorder we might clear out in our sweeping away! What appetites we might create in our preparing of delectable truths for our boys and girls! What beauty and distinction we might give the Church from that spiritual marriage within ourselves of faith and charity! There are countless opportunities for us to influence the future growth of the Church. I shall speak of but three: the spiritual nurture of children; the preparation of our boys and girls for marriage; and the education of our young people.

"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." I want to keep that "Song of degrees of Solomon" before me as I speak of the nurture of our children. It is easy to slip into the usual sentimentalities and psychological clichés about children without such a reminder. Modern psychology has accomplished splendid results in making available to the average immature parent age-old wisdom about human nature. But we must not deceive ourselves. It is perfectly possible to follow the formulas of child training, and not feel any of the pain of regeneration. It is perfectly possible to train our children with an admirable degree of efficiency and success, and leave the Lord out of the operation entirely.

Our relation with our children must be through the Lord. The direct relation between parent and child is fraught with the dangers of our familiar enemies: the love of rule, and the love of self. In children we can see without dissimula-

tion the same human evils we are all heir to. In children we can see the qualities of innocence and trust we strive for, and through children we can feel the sphere of the angelic heavens. Remembering these things, is there any other relation of human with human, aside from marriage, that offers greater chance for spiritual growth?

If we as parents want to get the full strength of influx from the Lord, our regeneration should coincide with the training of our children. We should pray that the Lord deliver us from the specific evils we see in our children. Through our own overcoming, the power of those particular hells that threaten may be lessened. Through our own refraining, the forces of spiritual growth may be quickened in our children. We cannot live their lives for them; but we can add to the accumulation of spiritual gain in our own generation, and give it as a heritage to the next generation, so that they may live more deeply than we have done, when their regeneration starts.

To live deeply in regeneration necessitates an early storing up of the powers of innocence in as great an abundance as possible; "for the light of good and truth inflows through remains" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 530). This is the material the Lord can use later in fighting the hells that will attack our children. We are not allowed to enter into deep temptations and so live deeply, unless we have these powers of innocence stored in great abundance.

For remains the Lord uses the tenderest affections. It is through these that a child learns most easily, because he is already in the love of the highest truths. A parent needs but to call them forth, cherish them, and protect them against harm. The Lord does the rest. The love of the Lord, the fear of the Lord, and the love of form, seem to me some of the most important and most neglected of these early affections.

The most effective way of cultivating the love of the Lord with children is through worship. There is no more sure way of telling little ones to love the Lord than to kneel with

them in humility of heart, so that we can feel His arms around the family; to praise Him readily and spontaneously, when blessings come to the family; to listen to His comfort in His Word, when troubles come. Can we live for a day without His tender care? Can He come in unless we open our hearts every day? How can mothers and fathers make this real with mere words, unless we ultimate it in daily worship in our homes?

The fear of the Lord, the fear of getting lost from our loving Father, can be a very real thing to children. I have watched rather wistfully the crowds of children with their parents, streaming into the early masses of our large Catholic churches. I was reminded that only fear of punishment made this possible. That is repulsive to us. We feel it is encroaching on human freedom and exploiting ignorance. But could we not use that fear that is born of love just as effectively to save the freedom of our children, open their minds to higher intelligence, and at the same time keep them in the fold of the Church? "Come, my children, I will teach you the fear of the Lord." "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." "And in thy fear will I worship toward thy holy temple."

Children have a love of form springing from their perception of the different degrees of the mind. They know the solemn joy of Sunday worship distinct from the common life of other days, until our own carelessness levels this down to dullness and neglect. They are sensitive to the difference between the inner world of spirit and the outer world, until we blur the distinction with too much deference to the demands of the outer world, and a shyness or suspicion toward the demands of the spirit.

The mediocrity of our thinking and feeling comes from our failure to be aware of the degrees of the mind, and from a loss of the connection between them. In trying to be practical we remain in the natural plane, cutting ourselves off from the light of the spiritual degree, and losing the power of the orderly descent of influx from the Lord. We

must save our children from this danger, preserve the height of the mind from the ordinary mind, and enrich the thinking and feeling of the church of the future.

We are too apologetic with our children about spiritual matters, too hesitant and too silent. Why do we lack the courage to teach them authoritatively, with enthusiasm and conviction? What wonderful opportunity is ours! Our young philosophers are asking the questions that all philosophers have asked since the beginning of philosophic questioning. Here they are in a new and strange world demanding to know the meanings of things about them. "Why?" does not mean merely why. It means "Tell me everything you know about it. Fit it into the scheme of things as I have learned it so far. Give it a beginning in the Source of all things, and an ending in its use to me." We are at a loss to know how to answer. Too long we have been thinking theologically of separate doctrines; and this is no material to use in answer to a philosopher. What the child wants is, wonderfully enough, what we ourselves need most as a corrective for our unrelated dogmatic thinking: a coherent philosophy.

A child's life, activities, and needs have given him the language and concepts of elemental things that can be translated for him into spiritual realities. He knows love, healing, being protected and saved from danger; he knows fear, hunger, pain, getting lost, going up and coming down. He loves the symbols of language in stories, and the symbols of form and color in pictures. What more than these do we need to answer his questions if we relate them all to the Lord? Relating everything to the Lord, starting with Him and ending with Him, is the secret of simplicity. The deeper we go into the mysteries of faith, the simpler our language becomes, the more closely connected with the elemental realities of our spiritual lives. We shall find ourselves using those wonderfully simple phrases of Swedenborg's with our children, and wonder at the clear beauty we missed when we read them with adult obtuseness.

I am told by many people that they had too much doctrine as children, and so they turned against it. It seemed dull and unreal to them, as church-going did. Is it possible that the dullness and unreality came from a kind of stagnation of thought with parents and teachers? The doctrines themselves can be so vibrant with life, stimulating, exciting, — and they can be so tender and loving! But there must be a steady influx from the Lord, a continual flowing of pure water to clear out old stagnations of prejudice, opinions, and unrelated dogmas.

Sometimes it seems as if the preparation of our young people for marriage was accomplished in the way the primitive mother teaches her children to swim by throwing them in the river. The children usually learn to swim, and the young husband and wife often learn some of the beauties of true marriage love. But the undertaking is too hazardous. All too often the swift, treacherous currents of superficial thinking about marriage carry the untrained ones into danger and tragedy.

Our young people, surrounded by the glamorous romance of movies and cheap literature, prompted by an eager desire to be admired, are sorely tempted to treat carelessly a precious gift and waste their emotions. How we are cheating them of the loveliness and innocence of true romance, when our instruction is so inadequate that it does not reach and stir them deeply!

We must meet this problem through the Lord. It is the only direct, practical way. Any other that goes that long way around through the intricacies of psychiatry and sex-education, while it may help, might not reach the goal we are seeking. A marriage can be orderly, decent, and even happy in a mild way, without any thought of spiritual rebirth or any turning to the Lord. There are certain physical, psychical, and ethical laws one can observe to attain a kind of happiness and order, and yet remain ignorant of the higher laws of order and blessedness. This type of marriage is part of the ordering of reformation. It is not part of a

regenerating life. It is not strong enough to bear the strain of incompatibility of temperaments and tastes. It succumbs to the attack of those hells that long to tear asunder the marriage of faith and charity. It cannot lift to a higher plane the young love that we call infatuation. It cannot sublimate to beauty and stability the blind, wandering urges of adolescence. It is not enough for our young men and women. It is not enough for the future growth of our Church that will reflect the state of marriage of its members.

In the Writings of the Church there are the clearest instructions and the most terrible warnings to guide us in thinking about education. How blind the purposes of our schools seem, when we read that all instruction is merely an opening of the way between the spiritual, the rational, and the natural degrees of the mind.

How little we have considered the uses of the rational in education! And yet it is the gateway between the external world and all we learn there, and the internal world of spirit and influx from the Lord. If the gate is wide open and swings readily in both directions, we can think spiritually while we are engaged in the uses of this world. We gain what Swedenborg calls "extension" in the realm of spirit, because we are consociated with angels. That is what brings us an elevation of mind and purity of feeling. But if the gateway is only occasionally opened, and never oiled with the love of the Lord and the neighbor, it cannot swing easily, and we are finally shut out of the higher regions of the mind. Consociation is then only with grosser spirits; thinking becomes obscured, and feeling dulled.

Let us think clearly of the implications of the statement that scientifics are the means of perfecting the rational or of destroying it. What does this mean to us in the problem of education? Our young men and women in colleges are at an age when their rational is being formed. What they learn, and how they learn it, may perfect this gateway, or it may shut it, so that there can be no traffic between the higher and lower minds, no way to heaven. Which way our youths

choose is of tremendous importance to the Church, for through the rational they are introduced into the Church. The Church cannot be instituted with any people, unless their interiors are opened.

Not even the most sanguine among us can believe we have provided adequately for this opening of the interiors of the mind. We believe that the work of regeneration is directed mainly to bringing about a uniting of the spiritual and the natural through the rational. But we have remained in generals, and have not taken this truth into the particulars of our children's education. It cannot be that we are complacent or indifferent where the highest interests of our young people are concerned. But what are we doing to ensure education against the barrenness and sterility we find in it?

Our thoughts turn inevitably to Urbana University, for that school was established to bring the truths of the Church into all the particulars of education. Urbana is the only instrument we have for this work, and it belongs to us. If our zeal is great enough, if our thinking is deep enough, we can use this instrument for the high purpose for which it was intended.

The innate possibilities of Urbana University under the influx from the spiritual heavens of understanding, are stupendous and thrilling. Why do we halt unbelieving at the threshold of this great undertaking? The reality of the school exists in the quality the name Urbana University implies; in the longing, labors, and faith of the few who understand. This spiritual reality can be ultimated in the material plane of the school. There might be several colleges for the needs and interests of different students, courses of study especially designed to meet the highest requirements of young men and women. We might have teachers who from the warmth of their own spiritual love of truth, could vivify what would otherwise be dead, unprofitable scientifics. We might have a body of students who seek knowledges not from intellectual pride, but from a hunger of true wisdom. What strength and vigor it would bring to our weak, dying

societies, when these consecrated young men and women would take their places in the church as leaders.

The Church will feel an acute need of the college more and more in the future. Its scope of usefulness must be broadened, not diminished. To provide for this purpose with only isolated doctrinal courses and services of worship is a waste and a neglect of our wonderful resources of instruction. To restrict the uses of the college to the usual standards and curricula of other colleges is the blindness of defeat. To cut down the innate possibilities built into it by the founders, by the charter, by the labors of a large number of the clergy at one time and another, by money poured into it from the church body, is an act of unfaith.

The youth of the Church is ready and waiting for some act of faith and authority to summon and lead them. The promise of youth is not in immaturity and lack of experience. It is rather in the fact that they can be led, that the patterns of their lives are not so fixedly set that it is hard to break through with new life. The significance of youth is the love of truth. We dare not use a compromise with falsity to appeal to their eagerness and honesty. Youth loves courage, vision, adventure, the zeal for a great cause. We have but to work in the spirit of these qualities to find a response from them in education. The Lord will be with us. Nothing can hinder us but vanity and falsehood. And this shall be the prayer from our hearts:

> Rid me, and deliver me from the hand of strange children, whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right hand is a right hand of falsehood:
>
> That our sons may be as plants grown up in their youth; that our daughters may be as cornerstones, polished after the similitude of a palace:
>
> That our garners may be full, affording all manner of store: that our sheep may bring forth thousands and ten thousands in our streets:
>
> That our oxen may be strong to labor; that there be no breaking in, nor going out; that there be no complaining in our streets.
>
> Happy is that people that is in such a case: yea, happy is that people whose God is the LORD. (Psalm cxliv, 11-15.)

CAROLYN ALLISON BLACKMER.

THE LAST TEMPTATION

By the Rev. Othmar Tobisch

FOR the searching Christian there is no deeper study throughout the Word of God than that of the temptations of the Lord. In them struggling man finds his own temptations reflected and conquered. Through them there opens à vista into the inner life of Jesus of the most appealing kind. In them our emotions of sympathy are touched.

The medieval Church has, with great psychological insight, offered to the believers this aspect of the Lord's life particularly in the suffering on the cross. Innumerable are the pictures of "Ecce Homo." Strewn over the countryside in Europe are the crosses bearing the suffering Christ. Some of the finest examples of medieval wood-carving have depicted the agony upon the cross.

No doubt the external or bodily side of the Lord's sufferings has been especially appreciated; and medieval art has made the most of it, in carving, in painting, in stained-glass windows, and in book illustrations. Its effects are still strong upon the simple mind, upon the peasant, upon the artistic temperament. But meanwhile, since the days of Galileo, of Descartes, of Swedenborg, a new mind has been in the making. This new mind demands a different approach to the life of the Lord on earth. The inner values of this life are coming to be known more and more. Spiritual men to-day are not satisfied merely with a picture on a canvas, or a body in fine wood, apparently writhing in pain. The cruder means of knowing are being supplanted by a searching of the inner texture, of the colors of emotions, of the lines of thought.

We still demand correctness of delineation, sureness in the substance of what is said; but the substance is now of the

meat of the spirit, and the blood of the truth. A new revelation has created a new school of thought, founded upon the knowledges of the life of the soul, of the operation of the mind, of the structure of the personality, called "Christ," "Son of Man," "Son of David," "Son of God," "the Word made Flesh," "My Lord and my God." Truly, now we are enabled to enter in a measure into the inner sanctuary of the Lord's Spirit, and with awe behold the glistening summits and the deeply shadowed valleys of His "Sinai."

This new knowledge of the internal life of the Lord is part of that event which is called in the teachings of our Church "the Second Coming"; a fuller revelation of Himself, of the processes involved in His overcoming the evils of the human race. It is the rejection of the accepted evils, and the setting up of new standards of life, through a wisdom and a goodness that were of God.

We may go through the life-story of our Lord, and set up a marker here and there, designating a place where a shaft can be driven into the inner structure of the Word, and the strata in all probability reveal eruptions of evil, demoniac assaults upon the universal love of men. Such places are, for example, the dialogue of the boy Jesus in the temple with his mother Mary; or, the most obvious of all, the temptations upon the mountain in the desert; or the coming of the mother and the brothers to Capernaum to fetch Him home; or the demand of the people in the meadows of Beth-Saida to make Him accept the kingship of Judea. Such markers trace the progressive increase in the difficulty and seriousness of His temptations.

But the most excruciating, the most consequential, of all His temptations was that on the cross. In it, as it were, all the other temptation-combats were included, re-enacted; through this last one the assault of the hells was fiercest.

We read, perhaps with too light a heart, in the Faith of the New Church, "He endured temptation, even to the passion of the cross." We realize it as part of our belief that it was so. We read also that this last temptation was

the most grievous. Yet very few Christians know the facts of this last and most grievous of all His trials and tests.

Let us ask the question: What really was the last and most grievous temptation of the Lord? Where is its Scriptural evidence? In what words is it expressed? Is it in the description of the beating of the Lord by the soldiery of a proud empire? Is it in their mockingly calling Him "King of the Jews"? Is it this humiliation in which there was the temptation to strike back, and reveal the power of the Son of Man?

No doubt these were serious attacks to be faced. But it was not beyond the power of the Lord to reject them easily. They touched only his natural mind, the external emotions, which were under control from childhood. The pride of Jesus could not be wounded by making him a mock-king. The physical hurts afflicted had been foreseen (Mark 10:32-34), and no resistance was made to evil minds striking against the corporeal manhood. "Hail, king of the Jews," was scarcely audible in the princely height of the spirit in which Jesus dwelt then. These lesser degrees of humiliation were permitted to show that the prince of the world had taken all possible liberty to destroy the human stronghold and container of Divine Love.

Evil influences coming from the lowest hells,—those of vicious love of dominion, of the lust of ruling,—were at work all the time. They came through channels sometimes never expected to carry evil loves. They came through the disciples (Matthew 16:23, 20:25), or through the family of Jesus (Luke 2:48, Matthew 12:46), or through his fellow-villagers (Luke 4:28), but most often through his self-declared enemies, the chief priests, the Pharisees, the Lawyers, the Scribes, the Sadducees. The hatred of the hells was fully concentrated on Him (Apocalypse Explained, nn. 1015-1017; 740 (15)). The hells hated God. They denied His overlordship. They attacked Divine Love in the Human, in Jesus Christ, to destroy its influence on and influx into men.

Let us realize this terrible situation. In the consciousness of the Lord was fought the battle of Armageddon, the battle between good and evil, between God and Satan. Outwardly it showed in such acts as the spitting, the hitting, the mocking. Inwardly, it was the white heat of the Lord's grievous and inmost combats, the last whereof was that of the cross.

If you consult the Gospels, you will find His deepest humiliation to be, that He was regarded as low as the lowest thief, crucifixion being the lowest means of execution in the Roman Empire. Though He gave Himself fully, unreservedly, to the human race, loving it universally and divinely, the very opposite was indicated by the manner of His death. This was His deepest humiliation. On its heels followed His most grievous temptation.

> And they who passed by scoffed at him, nodding at him in derision, and calling, "You were to destroy the temple, And build it in three days! Save yourself if you are God's son! Come down from the cross!" (Matthew 27:39, 40.)

This is, to my mind, the last and most grievous temptation. It started that internal combat in the last vestiges of the Human, which culminated in the words of Jesus: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me." It was directed against the *truth,* and yet this truth could not be demonstrated, because the freedom of the rational of the human mind was at stake. The Lord, in His Divine Power, realized fully that He was able by several means to come down from the cross. He could, for one thing, through the angelic spirits attendant upon the soldiers, influence these to lower the cross and take him off. (Compare Matthew 26:53.) He could by means of direct influx permit the application of certain natural laws, active only under special circumstances, —e.g., lightning to destroy the wood and iron,—leaving Himself unharmed. He took none of these roads. His road led to Golgotha, to prove the superiority of *spirit* over *body,* of rational judgment over sense impression. Should He come down from the cross, it would be forced upon the

evil minds that He was the Son of God, and their freedom of denying would be destroyed, their humanity would be destroyed and they actually would become animal forms only, since rationality and liberty are the two elements which distinguish men from animals. Since He alone loved the human race *universally,* He alone was willing to use every means to maintain the complete spiritual and rational freedom of every human being. All that which is truly human in man, his spiritual rationality and liberty, was at stake in that hour. Therefore, it was His most grievous temptation. He could, but would not, prove Himself to be the Son of God by coming down from the cross. If men could not believe the words which He had spoken, and which testified of Him, they were not ready to acknowledge Him as Divine.

The method which the evil ones used at the cross is similar to that of all satanic deniers of His Godhead. They do not believe interiorly in things Divine, but demand a sign from heaven so that they shall be convinced, outwardly. "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign. And there shall be no sign given to them, but the sign of the prophet Jonah." Looking down from the height of His suffering, He beheld the would-be-leader of the Church demanding a sign, and into His mind flashed again the words, judging the tree by its fruit,

> Ye vipers,—evil and adulterous generation, . . . how can Satan cast out Satan? (Matthew 12:22-45.)

The acid of their attack went deeper than we may suspect. The human from His earthly mother was put off by degrees, until only the last vestige remained clinging to His Human to enable Him to bear His last and most grievous temptation. Into this last shroud of earthly humanity the elders sent their poisonous arrows, wounding it to death. Though they aimed to bring about the ruin of Jesus, physically as well as spiritually, to prove to the world that He was not the Son of God, they in reality brought about the

greatest achievement ever attained by the Human, enlightened and vivified by the Divine.

> He saved others; himself he cannot save.
> He is King of Israel; let him now come down from the cross, and we will believe on him.
> He trusted in God; let him deliver him now,
> If he desireth him: for he said,
> I am the Son of God. (Matthew 27:42-44.)

The venom was put on the arrow, and it was sent into the heart of Christ. It worked. It worked in the last human vessels of uncertainty, corroding its feeling of sureness that it served the Divine, that it covered the Divine, and protected it. The hyena of disbelief sensed the mortality attendant upon the poison of doubt. Its howl went up from the bogs of *sensualia.* He is lost! He cannot save himself! Satans rejoice! Hells jubilate! He is sinking! His strength is leaving him! He is not sure any more himself whether or not he is the son of God! See him faltering! He is nearing the edge of the precipice! One step further and he will be lost forever, and the heavens will crash, and Götterdämmerung will be here.

And the clouds grew darker over Calvary; the sun hid itself, fearful of the outcome. "Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour." And about the ninth hour, the wave of despair engendered by the words of the evil ones neared its lowest point. At that moment Jesus uttered the words of the psalm: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" The material human was dissolved. Jesus cried with a loud voice. He yielded up his spirit. The veil of the temple was rent. His last temptation was over. Mark and Matthew know of no other words of Jesus. But John, who probed more deeply than any other into the inner life of the Lord, has the assuring assertion: *"It is finished!"* Love had won its battle over hate. Forgiveness had proven stronger than retaliation.

In conclusion, may we repeat that to all appearance the man Jesus hung helplessly upon the cross to which His

enemies had nailed Him. Essentially and actually He had all power in heaven and on earth, so far as the Divine was concerned; therefore it was the greatest temptation in the moment of utter helplessness to prove Himself all-powerful. Also, his human nature from the mother, which was the conduit through which passed all assaults of the evil and satanic ones, was about to be dissolved. This human was the cause that He spoke the words of forsakenness, since it was about to be put off entirely from the Human made Divine.

The testimony for our assertion that even the last and worst combat was fully won by the Lord, lies in the fact that He resisted in no way, spoke no word, attempted no action. "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," was His answer to all their attempts to hurl Him from the "throne" to which he was coming in His "glory." Evil did its best to bring this spiritual fortress down. But they could not overcome *Love* by their *hate*. It is invincible. The last temptation-combat was won by the force of love.

> The Lord from his earliest childhood, even to the last hour of his life in the world, was assaulted by all the hells, which were continually overcome, subjugated and conquered by Him, and this solely out of *love towards the whole human race*. And because this love was not human but Divine, and all temptation is great in proportion as the love is great, it may be seen how grievous were His combats, and how great the ferocity with which the hells assailed Him. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1619.)

Forever will sound in the ears of those who wished to rule Him and could not, their own cries: "If thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross." They will repeat it and repeat it; but no sign will be given them, the evil and adulterous generation.

For, in His last temptation, He rose from the conquest of the lowest hells and occupied rightly the throne of righteousness and the kingly glory of *Truth Itself* in the City of God.

OTHMAR TOBISCH.

Christmas Cards
Easter Cards
Celebrating the Birth and the Resurrection of Christ

Choice cards both of foreign and of domestic manufacture. Prices of Christmas Cards from 5 to 50 cents; of Easter Cards, 5 and 10 cents. Mail orders solicited, and satisfaction guaranteed.

The Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THE NEW CHURCH MAGAZINE

The Quarterly Organ of the General Conference of the New Church in Great Britain is the oldest New-Church periodical. It is of great interest to New-Church people in all parts of the world. Subscription price $1.25 per year, postpaid.

Order from the

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

SWEDENBORG'S WRITINGS

STANDARD EDITION, 30 vols., dark green cloth, $30.00, or $1.00 per vol. postpaid.

ROTCH EDITION, 32 vols., blue linen buckram, gilt top, $40.00; brown half morocco, full gilt, $125.00; sold only in sets, transportation at cost of purchaser. Separate titles of the Rotch Edition at special prices as shown in booklist sent upon request.

Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.

Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

SUBSCRIBE NOW FOR THE SWEDENBORG STUDENT

The Swedenborg Student is a monthly magazine, edited by Rev. Arthur Wilde, to help in the study of the Writings. It contains also the monthly Bulletin of the Arcana Reading Class.

Subscription price $1.00 per year.

To encourage new members to join the Reading Classes, the Swedenborg Student for one year and the first volume of the "Arcana Cœlestia," Standard Edition, are offered together for $1.50.

SWEDENBORG FOUNDATION

Incorporated

18 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

THE ROTCH TRUST FUND

Mrs. Lydia S. Rotch died in Boston, July 20, 1863, at the age of 80 years. She left $15,000 to be administered by three trustees for the benefit of the Convention. The activity of this Fund, administered by its successive three trustees, has been primarily that of the publication of Swedenborg's Theological Writings, commentaries compiled therefrom, and other works, as follows:

A complete edition of the Theological Works published by Swedenborg.

"The Worship and Love of God."

Commentaries on Matthew, John, Ezekiel and the Psalms.

Selections from Swedenborg, in raised type for the blind.

"Swedenborg, Harbinger of the New Age of the Christian Church," by Benjamin Worcester.

All of these publications are available through the several New-Church book-rooms, to wit:

UNITED STATES.

Akron, Ohio. New-Church Book Room 369 So. Maple St., Room 6.
Baltimore, Md. Swedenborg Book Center, 3812 Barrington Road.
Boston, Mass. Massachusetts New-Church Union, 134 Bowdoin St.
Chicago, Ill. Western New-Church Union, Rooms 1745-6, 17 N. State St.
Cincinnati, Ohio. New-Church Library, Oak Street and Winslow Avenue.
Los Angeles, Calif. New-Church Book Room, 509 So. Westmoreland Ave.
New York, N. Y. Swedenborg Foundation, Inc., 18 E. 41 St., Manhattan.
New-Church Press, 108 Clark St., Brooklyn Heights.
Philadelphia, Pa. New-Church Book Association, 2129 Chestnut St.
San Francisco, Calif. New-Church Library, 1640 O'Farrell St.
St. Louis, Mo. New-Church Book Room, 1215 Sunset Ave.
Washington, D. C. New-Church Library, 16th and Corcoran Street, N.W.
Wilmington, Del. New-Church Book Room, Penn Ave. and Broome St.

CANADA.

Toronto, Ont. Wm. H. Law, 561 Yonge St.

ENGLAND.

London. The Swedenborg Society, and The New-Church Press, Ltd., 20 Hart St., Bloomsbury, W. C. 1.
Manchester. New-Church Book Depot, 34 John Dalton St.
Glasgow, Scotland. Scottish New-Church Library, 229 Woodland Road.

AUSTRALIA.

Brisbane, Queensland. 345 Ann St., near Wharf St.

INDIA.

Bombay. Swedenborg Society of India, A. E. Penn, Sec., 33 Sussex Road, Bombay.

SWITZERLAND.

Geneva. Agence des Publications de la Nouvelle Eglise, 22 Rue de la Confederation.

The Fund assists, from time to time, in other New-Church uses to the extent that it has available funds; for example, the Neighborhood House at Lynn, Mass., to the support of which it regularly contributes. It has also coöperated in the publication of some of Swedenborg's scientific works, and of the photofacsimile reproductions of Swedenborg's theological manuscripts.

The original sum is intact, and the income only is used. This is, of course, entirely inadequate to help all the uses which come before the Rotch Trustees for contributions, including many for which other New-Church funds are not available because of their limitations. It is estimated that since the death of Mrs. Rotch, the trustees have spent over $65,000.00 in various church uses.

Will friends of the New Church continually bear in mind the importance of increasing the Rotch Trust Fund, whether by "giving while living" or by will?

The present Trustees are:

GEORGE C. WARREN, *President*,
CHARLES N. MASON,
JOHN W. HATHAWAY, *Secretary and Treasurer*,
18 Tremont St., Boston, Mass.